INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS
SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES, Volume 2

Indiana Slavic Studies vol I

Edited by
Michael Ginsburg &
Joseph T. Shaw

Jackson Library -UNCG
DR2.I6 c.1 NGUU
Indiana Slavic studies.
3 0510 05468650
v.1

The Wo
University of North Carolina

The LIBRARY

DR
2
I6
v.1

For Building Use Only

Indiana Slavic Studies

VOLUME I

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/indianaslavicstu0001mich

Indiana Slavic Studies

VOLUME I

A Collection of Studies
by
Members of the Faculty
of
Indiana University

Edited by

Michael Ginsburg and Joseph Thomas Shaw

Indiana University

Bloomington, Indiana

1956

DR
2
I6
v.1

Composed At The

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH CENTER IN ANTHROPOLOGY, FOLKLORE, AND LINGUISTICS

PHOTOLITHOPRINTED BY CUSHING - MALLOY, INC.
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
1956

PREFACE

This volume is a manifestation of the growing interest in the Slavic world shown at Indiana University. It was prepared in 1953-54, on the initiative of the Department of Slavic Studies, as the first collection of essays in this field by members of the faculty of Indiana University. The individual articles are not centered on one theme, but rather reflect the diverse interests of their authors, in the fields of history, government, literature, religion, folklore, and linguistics of the Slavic area. The second volume of Indiana Slavic Studies, now in preparation, will contain contributions by members of the Indiana University faculty, as well as by other scholars.

We acknowledge with gratitude our indebtedness to various persons, especially to Dean John W. Ashton, Vice President of Indiana University, and to Dean Ralph E. Cleland of the Graduate School, for their encouragement and assistance in the preparation of this volume.

Michael Ginsburg

Joseph Thomas Shaw

227758

In this volume, transliteration from Cyrillic is handled as follows: a popular system is used for transliterating names in text; the system of the Library of Congress is used for transliterating words, and also for names in bibliographical references.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Old Believer Avvakum:
His Writings . . . . . Serge A. Zenkovsky . 1

Koni and His Contemporaries:
Authors . . . . . Michael Ginsburg . 53

Soviet Thought in the Nineteen-Thirties:
An Interpretative Sketch . . . . . Robert V. Daniels . 97

Pan-Slavism and Czechoslovak Policy
During World War II . . . . . Václav Beneš . 137

Byron, the Byronic Tradition of the
Romantic Verse Tale in Russian, and
Lermontov's Mtsyri . . . . . Joseph Thomas Shaw . 165

Five Hucul Healing Incantations . . . . . Dov Neuman (Noy) . 191

The Origins of Slavic sǫbota . . . . . Bernard S. Mikofsky . 209

Russian Calques in the Balto-Finnic
Languages . . . . . Felix J. Oinas . 225

THE OLD BELIEVER AVVAKUM: HIS ROLE IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE

By Serge A. Zenkovsky
Instructor in Slavic Studies at Indiana University

I

The struggle of Protopope Avvakum[1] against the ecclesiastic reforms of the Patriarch Nikon in the mid-seventeenth century won him renown throughout Russia even during his lifetime. Long before he was burned at the stake in the square of Pustozersk,[2] Avvakum's unyielding defense of the Old Belief and his fifteen-year-long imprisonment there had made his name familiar to every Russian. The great prestige which Avvakum commanded among zealots of traditional Orthodoxy was founded not only upon his scathing rejection of reform in the Church books and rites, and in Russian life itself, but also upon the principal moving qualities of his epistles, sermons, and treatises, which circulated throughout Russia in a multitude of copies,[3] continually inspiring his followers with courage and renewed faith. Of the rich literature which he has left, Avvakum's Zhitie, his autobiography, furnished the Old Believers with a most enduring example of the spiritual obligations a Russian Orthodox believer must meet. The Protopope's friends and enemies alike were deeply impressed by his indomitable moral strength, which made him the most respected and beloved and also the most feared leader of the Old Believers. His spiritual integrity and burning faith attracted the admiration even of Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich, who was forced in 1667 to give final assent to the Church Assembly's condemnation of Avvakum.[4]

Throughout the reign of Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich Russia's attention was concentrated upon the division within its church. This religious struggle became a lesser preoccupation in the minds of the Muscovites toward the turn of the century, when during the turbulent regency of Tsarevna Sofia, wars with Sweden and Turkey, and then the reforms and secularization of Russian life under Peter the Great turned the attention of the Russian people away from the schism in the Church. With the passing of time

the chasm further deepened between supporters of the established Church, who comprised the majority of upper Russian society, and the Orthodox "traditionalists," who formed a minority strong economically and in numbers but lacking political influence. The Old Believers, as these traditionalists were called, became an isolated, distinct group of nonconformists cut off from the established Church and Westernized culture. Branded by the Church as dangerous rebels and persecuted by the imperial administration, which denied them the right to congregate, the dissenters lived completely apart from the main body of Russian society. Deliberately avoiding contact with the "Nikonians,"[5] the Old Believers rejected the secularized culture of imperial Russia and continued to live in spiritual seclusion according to the cultural tradition of the seventeenth century. In turn, Westernized Russian society paid little heed to the Old Believers, and until the latter part of the nineteenth century knew little about them. The writings of the leading dissenters, such as Protopope Avvakum, Deacon Feodor, Father Nikita Druzhinin, and the brothers Denisov, remained concealed in the homes of Old Believers, entirely unknown to Westernized Russian society, with the exception of a few historians and Church administrators.

The lack of interest displayed by Russian society and government for the Old Believers' writings and their spiritual life in general is a singular phenomenon. It stemmed from the imperial government's distrust of the Old Believers as antagonists of the Church and State. Conservative elements of Russia's Westernized society for the same reason had little sympathy for the deeply religious dissenters, seeing in them opponents of the established order, whereas Russian liberals understood even less the Old Believers' way of thinking and aims and regarded them as representatives of obscurantism, blindly opposed to the modernization of social and spiritual life.

A change in the imperial government's attitude toward these religious nonconformists came about during the reign of Alexander II, who allowed them legally to congregate.[6] The milder rules of censorship established by Alexander II permitted publication of the early Old Believers' writings, and they at last became available to wide circles of Russian readers. In 1860 N. S. Tikhonravov published the first edition of Avvakum's autobiography,[7] which was received as a revelation by lovers of early Russian literature, and met with such success that a second edition appeared two years later. Since 1862 Avvakum's Zhitie has been reprinted many times and has become accepted as a valuable part of Russian literature.[8]

Many scholars have devoted research to the Russian schism (raskol) and the writings of its leaders. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Russian historians looked mainly upon the writings of the Old Believers as a valuable primary source of information on Russia's seventeenth-century religious crisis, but they disregarded the spiritual make-up of the dissenters and the literary value of the first Old Believers' writings. The work of these early researchers is nevertheless important in revealing the origins and underlying conditions of the Russian schism. In the works of Kapterev, Klyuchevsky, Borozdin, and other Russian historians, the Old Believers were freed of the accusation of being solely responsible for the schism, and they appeared no longer as a destructive force but as the defenders of the Russian national tradition. A most important contribution of nineteenth-century historiography was the clarification of the central concept in the ideology of the Old Believers' movement, that of the "Third Rome," according to which the preservation of true Orthodoxy and hence in their view true Christianity was the mission of the Muscovite state, church, and society. Kapterev and Borozdin also established that the Old Believers had grown out of a group called the Zealots of Piety, who in the early years of the reign of Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich strove for a religious and moral revival among the people and clergy.[9]

A further step toward elucidation of the spiritual content of the Russian dissent has been taken in post-revolutionary times in the works of A. V. Kartashev, Fr. George Florovsky, and Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky, who have sought to reveal the spiritual nature of Old Believer thought. They have demonstrated that the aim of the leaders of Russia's schism was to shape Russian society in accordance with the moral teachings of the Church and to instill in the Russian people the religious principles of Orthodoxy.[10] Their ideal was what we now call otserkovlenie—the instilling of the harmonious spiritual transcendence of Orthodoxy in all spheres of life. The dissenters' uncompromising defense of the old rites and their strict interpretation of the canonical rules stemmed from a profound attachment to the ideal of a Christian state. Such a state, they felt, would prepare the way for the coming Kingdom of God and be responsible for the salvation of the souls of its citizens, as well as for the preservation of the teachings of the Orthodox Church. The Kingdom of God itself was envisioned by the Old Believers as an immense, universal Church, a sort of mystical Kitezh-Jerusalem,[11] in which most harmonious and reverent service of the Mass is being eternally conducted in

the solemn beauty of the traditional Orthodox ritual. The liturgic service of the Russian Orthodox Church was therefore regarded by the Old Believers as the instrument for universal salvation and for attainment of the mystical Kitezh, the coming Civitas Dei. The ritual itself, as S. Denisov explains it, is even a part of the "ancient sacred ecclesiastic dogma and the Church's way to salvation."[12] Consequently, in the eyes of the Old Believers any attempt to alter the ritual in any detail endangered the way to salvation and the eventual establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. In the light of this explanation of their defense of the Church ritual, the Old Believers' movement now appears to many Russian thinkers, not as an obscurantist reaction to change, but as a manifestation of the true Russian religious mind and mysticism. It may be further noted that the preservation of Orthodoxy was an acute problem of the time, because the Old Believers were awaiting with fearful anticipation the arrival of the Antichrist and the subsequent eradication of the true faith.

Along with clarification of the dissent's historical and spiritual background, a critical literary study of the Old Believers' literature was initiated. As mentioned above, the esthetic value of the writings of the early dissenters was overlooked by researchers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, for the fascinating personalities of Avvakum and his friends, as well as the role played by them in the schism, completely overshadowed the literary and artistic aspect of their works.[13] Even Russian literary critics have limited their remarks on Avvakum to mere biographical sketches and technical descriptions of his Zhitie, with a few brief paleographic commentaries; some of Avvakum's treatises were never even published before the revolution. Of the pre-revolutionary historians of Russian literature, only A. N. Pypin states: "Avvakum became a remarkable writer in the vernacular tongue.... His style and language bear witness to what line of development Russian literature of that period could have taken had it not become estranged from the native soil and had it not been condemned to a limited spiritual horizon."[14]

An appraisal of the esthetic qualities of the Protopope's writings was undertaken in the 1920's. Pioneering research in the field of a formal, artistic study of the Zhitie was carried out by V. V. Vinogradov,[15] who in 1923 thoroughly investigated the style of this work, concentrating his attention on Avvakum's use of Biblical figurative language and his sentence structure. Vinogradov has demonstrated how Avvakum carried over patterns of the figurative language of Church Slavonic into colloquial Russian,[16]

making the popular tongue the literary language. His analysis of Avvakum's method of writing and particularly his use of figurative language has remained the most important work in this field and has formed the basis for all later evaluations and studies of the Protopope's style.

In this esthetic evaluation of Avvakum, Vinogradov was followed by D. Sviatopolk Mirsky,[17] author of the well-known History of Russian Literature. Mirsky, in an article published in a Russian émigré review in Paris and analyzing the structure of the Zhitie, urged scholars and writers to pay more attention to Avvakum as a great master of the Russian tongue and to acquaint Russian readers with the Protopope's works. Mirsky called the Zhitie "a classic of Russian literature and one of the best examples of any author's work."[18] In the early 1920's cultural relations between Russia and the West had not yet been severed, and Mirsky's appeal was answered by Russian scholars. In 1927 appeared the best edition of Avvakum's writings; it was published by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and accompanied by valuable commentaries.[19] That same year P. Chernykh published a thoroughgoing research on the morphology and dialectical peculiarities of Avvakum's language,[20] and in 1935 N. K. Gudzy published a new edition of the Zhitie and others of Avvakum's most important writings.[21] This edition included a historical and literary analysis of the Protopope's works; they became the basis of the later evaluation of Avvakum's literary role in Gudzy's History of Early Russian Literature.

Gudzy considers the Protopope a "true innovator, the iconoclast of time-honored literary standards," for having introduced in his works, particularly in the Zhitie, not only realistic rather than stylized portraits, but also a genre new to the literary practices of the time: he transformed "the traditional genre of the 'Life,' with its stylized method and themes, into a sharply polemic autobiography—into a narrative about himself rather than about some remote saint."[22]

Another Soviet literary historian and critic, V. L. Komarovich, in a penetrating essay which is perhaps the best literary study of Avvakum's Zhitie, agrees with Gudzy's appraisal of Avvakum's role in Muscovite literature.[23] For Komarovich, as for most Soviet scholars, the fiery Protopope was a product of the disintegration of Old Russian society—of the profound crisis in Muscovite cultural life which preceded the revolutionary changes of the times of Peter the Great. Avvakum in his writings, according to Komarovich, reflects a transitional period: "The novelty

and daring of breaking with the traditional hagiographic rules of customary literary canons was evident to Avvakum himself."[24] Such a statement is, however, open to question; it reflects the attempt of Soviet scholars to present Avvakum as the representative of a radical, almost revolutionary, literary trend. Of far greater importance are Komarovich's views as to what are the main aspects of the Zhitie: the portrayal of the author's own psychological make-up and character, his defense of traditional Orthodox ideology, and the revelation of the moral and spiritual values of the Russian mode of life (byt).[25] Komarovich maintains that Avvakum's interpretation of the Russian byt, as well as of the spirit and structure of the Russian family, was dependent upon his own religious concepts; the Protopope saw in the Russian family the most promising guardian of Orthodoxy.[26] Komarovich further stresses the polemical character of Avvakum and his "passionate sharpness," which exceeds that of any other Russian polemical writer.[27]

The opinion of Soviet critics that Avvakum was a typical representative of the "new times" is held also by Komarovich's coauthor of the Academy History of Russian Literature, D. S. Likhachev. But although Likhachev adheres to the theory of Avvakum's "literary modernism," he is primarily interested in the powerful varied emotions reflected in the Protopope's works and his ability at character protrayal. He rightly maintains that Avvakum belongs to the school of "psychologists" which developed in the seventeenth century and was so well represented by the anonymous author of Savva Gruditsyn and by Feodor Griboedov in his history of Russia written for the children of the Tsar.[28] A. A. Kaev, author of a textbook of Russian literature, also emphasizes the elements of literary modernism in Avvakum's work and makes the well-founded comment that the Zhitie is the first account in Russian literature "of a person's own life presented against the wide background of the family and society."[29]

II

The contribution of contemporary Russian critics to the determination of the literary and esthetic value of Avvakum's writings has caused a re-evaluation of the earlier estimation of Avvakum and has brought him into the front line of Russian writers. Most of the Protopope's literary methods as well as his language and style have been thoroughly investigated in recent studies, all of which emphasize that the esthetic qualities of the Zhitie, the vivid revelation of character, and Avvakum's powerful mastery of

the Russian tongue testify to his effectiveness not only as an active and dangerous raskol'nik (schismatic) but also as a penetrating psychologist and skillful writer. Still, these researches have not succeeded in making the final determination of Avvakum's real place in Russian letters. The assertion that he was "a daring innovator" and "iconoclast," a man who broke with the traditions of genre, style, and language in Muscovite writing, cannot be maintained after Avvakum is studied against the background of pre-Petrinian Russian literature. It is also difficult to agree with the now popularly held opinion that Avvakum's literary work was the product of a cultural upheaval which later, in the eighteenth century, assumed definite form in Russian letters and life. Avvakum's most distinctive quality in his writings was not his novelty of form and language but rather the remarkable artistic talent and powerful spirit which characterize all of them. I submit that his passionate sincerity, so forcefully transmitted in his autobiography, treatises, and epistles, and his extraordinary talent should cause Avvakum to be regarded as the greatest writer of Muscovite Russia, occupying in Muscovite letters as prominent a place as does the author of The Lay of the Host of Igor in the literature of Kievan times.

The autobiographic genre in which Avvakum's Zhitie is written cannot be regarded as an epoch-making literary innovation, for it constituted a natural outgrowth from the previous literary pattern. Despite its alleged novelty, numerous earlier examples of this genre were known in Muscovite Russia. Both early Christian literature and Russian lay writings of pre-Petrinian times furnished many models for the writing of autobiography. Avvakum, in relating his own life, simply adapted for his life story and developed further an already familiar form. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles offer numerous autobiographical details. The autobiographical pattern in early Christian literature best known to Russians is that furnished by Dorotheus, a sixth-century Syrian monk, archimandrite of the monastery of Majume, whose book of Instructions was published in Moscow in 1562[30] at the time of Awakum's association with the Moscow printing house and with the Zealots of Piety. Dorotheus' Instructions was not itself the first work in this genre in Christian literature but followed the examples given in Greek by Aquilius Severus, a Spanish ecclesiastical writer, and Gregory of Nazianz, both of whom wrote in the second half of the fourth century. The Confessions of St. Augustine also preceded and influenced the work of Dorotheus. Avvakum himself refers in the first sentence of his Zhitie to Dorotheus as

his inspiration for the writing of his life.[31] In early Russian literature almost from its very beginning can be found examples of autobiographical writing such as The Testament of Vladimir Monomakh and The Supplication of Daniil the Exile of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The Testament of Vladimir Monomakh contains many episodes from Vladimir's life, given in the framework of the dying Prince's admonitions to his children, and in its severe style it is particularly close to Avvakum's Zhitie, which was also intended as a spiritual testament to his fellow-believers. The merging of the recounting of events in the authors' lives with quotations from ecclesiastical literature, the use of certain figures of speech and also of a mixture of vernacular Russian and Church Slavonic,[32] and the combination of autobiographical details with exhortations are common to Vladimir Monomakh's Testament and Avvakum's Zhitie.

From the sixteenth century on, autobiographical writing becomes more common. The first chapter of Prince A. M. Kurbsky's History of Ivan IV has a strong touch of the autobiographical, especially in its account of Kurbsky's personal relations with the Tsar.[33] Other chapters of the History as well as Kurbsky's letters to Ivan contain many details of the life of this sixteenth-century Russian émigré.[34] Kurbsky's renowned correspondent, Tsar Ivan IV, in his own voluminous communications, has also left several accounts of his own turbulent life. His letters to Prince Kurbsky and to the monks of the Kirilo-Belozersky Monastery reveal the story of his unhappy childhood and youth, his years on the Kazan campaigns, his illness, and his attitude toward Kurbsky and the boyars. Another of the Tsar's works which includes numerous references to his own life is contained in the collection of the Decisions of the Council of 1551, known by the name of Stoglav.[35] In Muscovite letters of the time of Ivan IV autobiographical excerpts can be found, as for instance in the sixty-fourth chapter of the Domostroi, written by Archpriest Silvester,[36] and in the Kazan Chronicle, whose author was an anonymous prisoner of war in Kazan.[37]

Two very interesting documents at least partially devoted to the lives of their authors, outstanding representatives of Russian cultured society of that time, date from the early seventeenth century. One is the Household Notes by Prince Semion I. Shakhovskoy (d. 1645), a prolific writer who left extensive information on his life and times.[38] The other, no less engaging, is the work by Prince Ivan A. Khvorostinin-Starkovsky (d. 1625), an intimate friend of the Pseudo-Dimitry and one of the first Russian Westernizers; in a

sense he could be considered a precursor of Chaadaev and Pechorin.[39] Many other writings from the Time of Troubles make extensive use of autobiographical material, such as the Skazaniia of Avraamy Palitsyn, a well-known patriot and monk of the Holy Trinity and St. Sergius Monastery, and the Message of a Nobleman by Ivanets Frunikov.[40] The monk Arseny the Deaf, a close contemporary of Avvakum and an editor in the Moscow Printing House, left in his letters to Priest Ivan Lukianovich and the Boyar Saltykov not only an interesting description of the life of the Russian clergy but also an extensive report on his own life and deeds.

In addition to these numerous works, many of which were no doubt available to Avvakum as literary patterns for his Zhitie, the literature of the early seventeenth century abounds with innumerable vitae—biographies of saints, tsars, and prominent personalities of the period. A peculiarity of the vast majority of the vitae of this period is that they were written by contemporaries of their heroes, usually upon the death of the latter. In these vitae the hero is described in a lively and realistic fashion, and even in the life of a saint the usual hagiographic stylized details are not used, the description of miracles is reduced to a minimum, and the saints themselves are portrayed as living individuals. The vita was one of the most popular genres of the era preceding and during the schism, the most familiar being The Life of Iuliania Lazarevskaia, written by her son; the Story of the Cross of Unzha; the story of Solomonia the Possessed; the life of Tsarevich Dimitry, written by Patriarch Iov, who knew him personally; and the life of Prince Mikhail Skopin-Shuysky, written by an anonymous contemporary. In the later seventeenth century there appeared in the same genre the biographies of Archimandrite Grigory (better known under his lay name, Ivan Neronov), of the Boyar Rtishchev, and of numerous Old Believers. There is no reason to think that all of these works were known to Avvakum, but they well reflect the trends in the development of hagiography and other genres during the 1600's, and they demonstrate that Avvakum's autobiographical genre was not unique in its period. The fact that the Zhitie was widely and enthusiastically read, even by the most conservative of Avvakum's followers, would seem to indicate that his readers were already acquainted with the genre of autobiography and accepted it as established.

While Avvakum's Zhitie, as has been pointed out, has much in common with Monomakh's Testament in its structure and in its use of direct address and narration, it is still closer to the Letters of Ivan IV. Both the Protopope and the Tsar were outstanding

personalities of their respective centuries and astonishingly alike in their main characteristics—both were uncompromising, passionate, and violent. Each dedicated his life to attempting to realize an ideal—the strengthening of the Russian State, in the case of Ivan, and the preservation of the Russian Orthodox tradition, in that of Avvakum. Each of them used his writings as a weapon in his ideological struggle. And each in his zeal dealt a terrible blow to the object of his devotion. Ivan came close to ruining his nation by undermining its social structure and economy; Avvakum, by initiating opposition to the Orthodox hierarchy, weakened the very institution he meant to strengthen, and by leading the conservative Orthodox into nonconformity, he deprived the Church of its most faithful and ardent supporters. The similarity of Ivan and Avvakum is also revealed in their methods and style of writing, for the Tsar's messages to Kurbsky, like Avvakum's Zhitie[41] and his letters, were propagandistic works presented as personal messages. Both the Tsar and the Protopope were intent upon molding the opinion of Russian society, and each indulged in threats, vituperations, and words not ordinarily used in polite society, interspersed with attempts at arousing sympathy by references to his own life. The Protopope's intermixture of narrative with quotations from patristic and dogmatic literature and violent passionate outbursts, probably often calculated in their effects, is almost a reproduction of the style of Ivan. Again like the Tsar, Avvakum often interrupts his narrative, in the Zhitie and his treatises alike, with direct harangues at the reader or menacing diatribes addressed to his enemies. His outbursts of wrath, spite, and mockery bear close resemblance to Ivan's epistolary habits.[42] Both men are representatives of the Muscovite polemical school, which was characterized by impassioned utterances; the exchange between Ivan and Kurbsky is a particularly striking example. Like his literary predecessors of the century of Russia's great medieval publicists, Ivan was fundamentally a polemicist, keeping to the firmly established tradition which began with the messages of Bishop Gennady against the Judaizers and the famous controversy between the Trans-Volga hermits and the Josephites in the late fifteenth century.[43] The Protopope introduced into the genre of the polemic more passion, more genuine and spontaneous indignation and wrath, and more expressive and colorful language and colloquialisms than his predecessors. No one presents such a contrast of narrative and harangue as does the Protopope, who turned his writing into a trenchant and dangerous weapon in controversy.[44] Incomparably

more talented a writer than the Tsar and his many predecessors, Avvakum represents the final and sharpest phase of Muscovite polemical letters.[45]

The question remains however whether the writings of Tsar Ivan IV were actually known to Avvakum and whether the Protopope's works directly reflect the influence of the Tsar's Letters. Avvakum sojourned several times in the Russian capital of Moscow during the years 1641 to 1651 and spent fifteen months there in 1652-53. Later, upon his return from exile in Siberia, he lived in Moscow from February to August 1664. The memory of Ivan IV was particularly vivid in Moscow in 1652-53, the year of the transfer of Metropolitan Filipp's remains to Moscow.[46] This event, as well as the reading of the Chronograph and decisions of the Stoglav, in which Ivan's speeches are included, must certainly have drawn Avvakum's attention to Ivan's polemics. The Stoglav, code of traditional Russian ecclesiastical rules compiled at the Council of 1551 and put on the Index of Prohibited Books after the reform of Nikon, became the main source of the Old Believers' arguments and was well known to Avvakum. That Avvakum was well aware of the deeds of Ivan IV is also evident, for despite his veneration of Metropolitan Filipp,[47] a victim of Ivan's wrath, the Protopope had respect for Ivan's treatment of his enemies. He even recommended for the Patriarch Nikon the same fate which Ivan customarily bestowed upon traitors: "Like the good Tsar, I would have hanged him [Nikon] on a high tree.... The dear [milenkoi] Tsar would soon have found a treatment for this dog!"[48]

The Tsar's writings were well known among learned Muscovites of Avvakum's time and their existence in numerous well-preserved copies dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries certifies to their inclusion in numerous mid-seventeenth-century libraries and private collections.[49] As a member of the board of editors of the Moscow Printing House and of the ecclesiastical elite of the time, Avvakum no doubt had ready access to the libraries of the Patriarch, of the Printing House, and of private collectors. The depth of his erudition and extensive knowledge of Russian ecclesiastical and lay literature may even be attributed to the years 1652-1653 (the only happy period of his life), when he lived in Moscow, a venerated priest and preacher. These years, as has been noted, coincide with the date of the celebration of St. Filipp and with a period of aroused interest in the time of Ivan IV, and Avvakum could easily have come across the polemical writings of Ivan IV at that time. The absence of obvious borrowings

from the works of Ivan can be explained by the fact that Avvakum did not memorize secular works as he did ecclesiastical literature and that during his Pustozersk incarceration, the major period of his literary activity, no books except the Holy Scriptures were available to him.

III

All of Avvakum's writings bear witness to his extensive and attentive reading of Russian ecclesiastical and lay literature, and also to his unusual memory. Abundant quotations from the Bible, from the works of the Holy Fathers, from Byzantine historians, and from the Russian Chronicles demonstrate the Protopope's complete familiarity with the literature available to the seventeenth-century Russian. His remarkable memory preserved for him Muscovy's literary heritage even during his imprisonment, when he was deprived not only of books but even of the most basic articles of daily existence, as is witnessed by what he himself wrote at that time: "My dears! I remain here covered with dirt! There is not even a thread on me, only my cross and beads to fight the devils with." Despite deprivation he devoted much time and effort to writing down his thoughts, and on nearly every page of his Zhitie and treatises he quotes with ease from the Psalms, Song of Songs, and the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles. He refers to passages from the Chronograph, from Chetii Minei, History of the Judaic War, Marguerite,[50] The Tale of the White Cowl, The Golden Mirror, and numerous other historical and patristic works contained in Muscovite book collections of that time.[51]

Like the works of all Russian pre-Petrinian medieval writers, Avvakum's writings abound in the traditional metaphorical usages found in early Christian literature and in the translations of Byzantine writers. Such metaphorical usages were an inherent element of early Russian stylistics, and from the literary language it was carried into colloquial speech. A frequently used image which apparently caught the fancy of Avvakum was the boat as a symbol of man's destiny, deriving from the Biblical metaphor of the Divine Pilot and the story of Christ walking on the Sea of Galilee. This popular image is often encountered in medieval Russian literature, and Avvakum uses it generously and with great mastery when he wishes to stress the dependence of human fate upon the limitless might of God. Early in his career the Protopope had a vision of two boats, and he relates it as follows: "...a man sitting in one of the boats answered, 'Yours is this boat; go

on it, with your wife and children, if you have a dismal life.' I woke up and thought, 'What is this vision? What does it presage?' "[52] He later interpreted this vision as a prediction of his subsequently turbulent life. Avvakum applied this image in both a literal and symbolical meaning in connection with an occasion when he actually set forth on a sea voyage, and its use gives added expressiveness to his narrative.[53]

The Protopope liked very much to use the season of winter metaphorically, particularly in his portrayal of misfortune. Avvakum picturesquely describes the reforms of Nikon as the "winter of heresy,"[54] and masterfully connects the metaphor with the natural phenomenon. Upon Nikon's announcement of changes in the liturgic text, Avvakum and his friends "became deeply concerned because winter was coming; their hearts were chilled and their legs began to tremble."[55] The tempest likewise is applied metaphorically in furnishing an image of personal tribulation. In the description of a disagreement with a local administrator, for example, Avvakum states, "He called forth a tempest against me."[56] These traditional metaphors and allegories were used by Avvakum not only as literary artifices but also as a means of portraying his heroes and enemies more vividly and bringing them closer to popular understanding. He uses extensively, especially in arguments with his enemies, animal epithets and expressions which have a well-established tradition in medieval letters.[57] Even such unflattering designations as "swine," "wolves," "dogs," etc., which flavor the writing of the Protopope, are terms common to the literature of that era, having their origin in bestiaries.[58]

Extensive quotation, use of literary metaphors, allegories and epithets, the mingling of literary Russian with Church Slavonic, and the application of Biblical and medieval imagery, are the characteristics which relate the Zhitie and other of Avvakum's works to preceding Russian literature and determine their place in the evolution of Muscovite literature.[59] Undeniably, Avvakum's style and language are closer to the vernacular of the seventeenth century and richer in the vocabulary of the people than most works of his time, but this constitutes only a further step in literary and stylistic development—the replacement of archaic vocabulary and grammar by the living language.[60]

From the very beginning of Russian literature in the eleventh century, there had been waged a continual struggle for dominance in literature between Church Slavonic and vernacular Russian.[61] In the late fourteenth century, during the time of the Mongol Yoke,

Russia's cultural weakness facilitated the success of a new South Slavic literary tradition which had revived the use of Old Church Slavonic in literary writings. This new literary school, which arose in the Balkans under the influence of the mystical movement of Hesychasts in the mid-fourteenth century, had as its main characteristics a rhetorical, elevated style, ornate language, the use of symbolism, the use of complex neologisms of one word made up from two or three words, and the renascence of archaic vocabulary and grammatical forms dating from the time of SS. Cyril and Methodius. This new trend in Slavic literature was particularly championed in the Bulgarian capital, Trnovo, by Patriarch Euthimeos and his pupils; it was brought to Russia by Bulgarian and Serbian émigrés after the conquest of their countries by the Turks.[62] Its influence in literature was so strong that in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries Church Slavonic once again replaced the popular tongue in Russian literature. Epifany Premudry, one of the first Russian followers of this South Slavic tradition, called it pletenie sloves ("knitting of words"); this new, overly ornamental style became known in Russian literature as vitiistvo.

In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, with the strengthening of the Russian state and its culture and with rapid intellectual and literary progress, the vernacular began to penetrate literary writing once again. Indeed, in some types of writing literary Slavonic had never been used, such as in the codes of law, in acts of chanceries, and in private correspondence, all of which were written in almost pure vernacular Russian.[63]

The evolution of Russia's literary language became more complex after the Time of Troubles in the early seventeenth century. This political upheaval undermined the faith of many Muscovite gens de lettres in their culture and tongue. Some of them, like Ivan Timofeev, Shakhovskoy, and Palitsyn, attempted to revive the Byzantine stylistic tradition and form, seeking in this literary "reaction" a cultural antidote for Russia's spiritual harrassments. For example, one of the best historical works of the time, Ivan Timofeev's Chronicle, was written in intricate, rhetorical language with heavy, stylized sentences and such a profusion of complex word-coinages that some passages are hardly comprehensible.[64] Other writers underwent Western influence and used rhymed lines in their works, in imitation of Polish and West Russian versification. The Life of Tsarevich Dimitry by Patriarch Iov and the Narrative of Avraamy Palitsyn, both written partially in verse form, have obvious traces of the influence of

this Western style of writing.[65] A third new tendency, that of writing in the pure vernacular, can be found in the Letter to a Nobleman by Ivanets Frunikov,[66] and in the story of the death and burial of Prince Mikhail Skopin-Shuysky. Frunikov's Letter is the earliest precursor of the later satires and parodies which had their origin in the lower urban milieu and were written in the colloquial tongue.[67] The anonymous story of Prince Shuysky's death incorporates an entire folk song in a literary work for the first time without altering the vernacular.[68]

In the first part of the seventeenth century the vernacular spread into new literary genres, in the translations of popular narratives and novels, such as Bova Korolevich and Eruslan Lazarevich. Developing according to the pattern established by Frunikov, the vernacular won an ever stronger position in the new genres of Russian narrative, satire, and parody. The continued utilization of colloquial language and direct speech in the tales and the growth of realistic psychological sketches began to secularize literature, and an increasing amount of lifelike detail in these works evidences a link between the literature of that period and the writings of Avvakum. Some of these works, like those sections of Avvakum's writings in the vernacular, are quite understandable and entertaining even for the most inexperienced student of Old Russian literature or for present-day readers.[69]

Old Believer literature of the 1660's and 1670's strongly reflects this tendency toward the nationalization of the literary language. Along with Avvakum, Father Nikita, and Deacon Feodor, many other Old Believers took a hand in turning the Great Russian vernacular into a weapon of defense against the denationalization of Russian life and culture.[70] Avvakum himself appealed directly to the Tsar to condone the use of colloquial Russian, admonishing: "You, Mikhaylovich, are a Russian, not a Greek. Speak your native tongue. Stop setting it at naught in the Church, at home, and in your speech.... Breathe well in the old style..., and say in the Russian tongue, 'God, be merciful unto me, a sinner.'"[71]

Avvakum's writing differs, however, from that of his fellow-believers in its more intense use of the new style and the language of the people. With the exception of Avvakum and Monk Epifany, the Old Believers continued to maintain in their writings the atmosphere of ecclesiastical literature. They wrote in a simplified version of Church Slavonic, using fewer difficult and archaic grammatical forms and introducing, more generously than their predecessors, words and morphological features of the vernacular. This language was easier, plainer, and more accessible to

readers than that of the early seventeenth-century writers, and was assuredly more understandable to the Muscovite mind than the Westernized rhetorical language of Simeon Polotsky or the heavy style of the admirers of the Byzantine tradition. Nikita Druzhinin's Supplication and Deacon Feodor's theological treatises and epistles, the best examples of the Old Believers' manner of writing, have a simple, clear, and expressive style, but Druzhinin, Feodor, and a number of other Old Believers still adhered to the traditions of Muscovite ecclesiastic literature. Their style reflects that they had a good schooling; they are more formal, more matter-of-fact, and less plain spoken, less outspoken than Avvakum. They were conservative also in their use of the Russian vernacular, reducing its use to a considerably smaller proportion than did the Protopope,[72] who not only made use of vernacular words, expressions, and grammatical constructions, but wrote entire passages in the language of the common people. Avvakum used colloquial and even obscene epithets liberally and with obvious relish, completely unabashed by even the most indecorous.[73]

In his autobiography Avvakum uses Church Slavonic turns of phrase primarily in quotations and in short discourses on ecclesiastical matters; most of the story of his life and a large part of his letters and even commentaries are set down in colloquial Great Russian. The language of Nikita Druzhinin and Deacon Feodor was intended as a simplification and Russianization of Church Slavonic, but Avvakum in his writings effected the actual substitution of Great Russian for the traditional, preponderantly Church Slavonic literary language. In the Zhitie and other works of Avvakum, this Great Russian vernacular, rendered more expressive and malleable by stylistic patterns borrowed from Biblical and ecclesiastical literature, became a powerful literary tool. In this respect the Protopope's work is more akin to the traditions of popular literature, translated novels, folk narratives, satire, parodies, and even to some historical writings, than to ecclesiastic literature or chronicles.[74] Besides the Moscow version of Russian, which was the customary language of official state documents and became that of the new, "lower" genres of narrative and satire, Avvakum used the dialect of his own birthplace. All his work bears traces of the dialect spoken in the environs of the village Grigorievo on the upper Volga.[75] Extensive use of the postpositional article, which in Avvakum's works preserves even the gender, number, and case, is one of the characteristics of the upper Volga dialects, which found expression in his writing, giving it a particularly local and homely flavor.

Avvakum's intermingling of the vernacular tongue and Church Slavonic, and his constant use of different linguistic features and styles can be regarded as an experiment in the integration of the various trends in Russian literature, as well as in the creation of a literary language understandable to all classes of the population and suitable for many and varied purposes. Such a uniform, national literary language was finally developed only in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries,[76] but Avvakum's language was a far more satisfactory solution of the problem than were the early eighteenth-century formulas for a "lower" and a "higher" style.[77] D. Sviatopolk Mirsky justly states that Avvakum is the only Russian writer who has successfully solved the problem of the use of Great Russian popular speech in literature: "Rozanov and Leo Tolstoy only photographed the popular tongue, while Avvakum molded it into new forms for his own purposes, transfigured it, widened its use, and gave to this tongue a new, purely literary value. His style therefore is active, original, literary, creative."[78] This language preferred by the Old Believers and especially by Avvakum, stands in sharp contrast to that subsequently evolved by the official Russian literary school, and represents a protest against submission of the Muscovite literary language to the South and West Russian influences which made their appearance at the turn of the sixteenth century and which predominated after the middle of the seventeenth century.

Around 1650 West Russian cultural influence, which was looked upon with favor by Patriarch Nikon and the Court, grew stronger.[79] Many Orthodox monks from Polish or Lithuanian lands settled in the Russian capital, and books printed in Lvov, Kiev, and Vilna penetrated to Moscow. In 1649 the Kievan monks, Epifany Slavinetsky and Arseny Satanovsky moved to Moscow, where they set about translating the ecclesiastical books, and in 1663 they were joined by the famous Simeon Polotsky, who became the teacher of the Tsar's children and the recognized head of the prevailing Westernized literary school.

Imported books and monks brought to Moscow a new literary pattern and a version of Church Slavonic imbued with West Russian, Polish, and Latin vocabulary and grammar. The traditional Muscovite version of Church Slavonic, blended with some Great Russian elements, began to lose ground in official translations and contemporary literary works to the West Russian version, and, likewise, Great Russian forms in ecclesiastical literature were gradually replaced by West Russian. West Russian linguistic and literary influence became dominant toward the end of the seven-

teenth century, and the literary language of the eighteenth century was the continuation of the Kievan, rather than the Muscovite, literary tradition.[80]

Avvakum and the Old Believers strongly resented these new trends in Muscovite culture and literature, and opposed not only Church reforms but also the earliest manifestations of Russia's Westernization. In their view the Church reforms and growing Western influence in Russian life and culture presaged the doom of traditional Muscovite culture and would lead to the nation's spiritual and moral corruption.

IV

Persecution and imprisonment were greatly instrumental in the development of Avvakum's literary works and in the formation of his particular style. The Protopope did not belong to the circles of professional Muscovite men of letters, and his writings reflect strongly his unpreparedness for a literary career. He quite frankly acknowledged this lack of literary training: "I am ignorant in knowledge of the word but not in that of reason. I was not taught dialectics, rhetoric, and philosophy, but I have within me the understanding of Christ. As the Apostle says, 'But though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge.'"[81] But during his long imprisonment, when he was separated from his flock and other listeners to whom he could unfold his pent-up thoughts, faith, beliefs, and ideas, Avvakum took to the pen. Compelled to write by want of direct contact with his followers, he overcame the obstacle of unceasing surveillance and succeeded in bringing his words to his fellow-believers and friends throughout Russia.[82]

A comparison of the style and language of Avvakum's writings in the various phases of his literary activity demonstrates his steady progress toward literary maturity and ever-increasing stylistic independence, while the intensiveness of his writing reveals the deep-seated motivation which urged him on toward literary creation. From the early period of the Protopope's ecclesiastical career, that preceding his first exile to Siberia in 1653, only one letter has been preserved.[83] This letter, the oldest existing fragment of Old Believer literature, is written in the conventional literary style of the time. It abounds in Church Slavonic vocabulary and grammatical forms, and the sentences are long and heavy. Another work of Avvakum, dating also from the year 1653, a supplication to the Tsar Alexey, written in collaboration with Protopope Daniil of Kostroma, has not been preserved. It may be assumed that this supplication opposing the reforms in the ritual

prescribed by Patriarch Nikon was at least as formal and conventional as Avvakum's personal letter to his closest friend Neronov. The fact that Avvakum, first assistant to the influential Protopope Neronov, sought the co-operation of the provincial priest Daniil, also may indicate that Avvakum was at that time not quite confident in his own literary skill and knowledge of dogma.

There is no evidence of any literary activity on his part during the ten years' banishment of Avvakum to Siberia, when he was allowed to continue his preaching and ministerial work. Seven letters dating from the years 1664-1667, the time of Avvakum's last sojourn in Moscow and the early years of his last exile, have been preserved.[84] Most of these, especially a letter to the Boyar Andrey Pleshcheev, written in 1664, reflect Avvakum's continued dependence on the conventional ecclesiastical style. In his first Supplication to Tsar Alexey, however, elements of the vernacular speech make their appearance, and in the Protopope's report (dating from the year 1663-64) on the cruelty of Afanasy Pashkov, commander of the Siberian detachment to which Avvakum was assigned during his first exile, vernacular elements are stronger. The style of this report is closer to that of Avvakum's Zhitie, which is in fact partially based on the report.

The trend of Avvakum's literary evolution becomes evident in the Zhitie, a product of the early 1670's: in his discussions of dogmatic problems and in quotations from the Holy Scripture the Protopope uses Old Slavonic, whose style and vocabulary are completely familiar to him. In narrating the story of his life and in descriptions Avvakum takes recourse to the vernacular language. During these years—the 1670's, the years of his imprisonment in the miserable earthen cell of Pustozersk—was written almost the whole of his literary work: three versions of his autobiography, his numerous treatises, and voluminous correspondence; in all, nearly a hundred pieces. No Russian writer before Avvakum had been so prolific,[85] and Avvakum himself began to write profusely only after he became isolated from the world.

All the works written in Pustozersk reflect the same features: extensive early reading and a thorough knowledge of the ecclesiastical literature of his time, an excellent memory and skillful use of the stylistic materials with which he was familiar, and an independent way of combining the literary genres and styles with which he had become acquainted before his imprisonment. The simultaneous use of various styles and even of different genres in his work is not the result alone of an intended nationalization of the literary language or of creative independence. When his nar-

rative overrode the limits of the accepted models known to him, Avvakum remained without patterns for his descriptions and vivid characterizations. However, his desire to strengthen his fellow-believers and to oppose the bearers of reform forced him to write and to create new, previously unknown stylistic forms. Had he done his writing in the midst of the Muscovite literate milieu contemporary to him, surrounded by old Church Slavonic folios, Avvakum would no doubt have had recourse to the stylistic methods developed by earlier Muscovite writers and to the advice of friends and co-workers, and his work would have undergone the influence of such an environment. His writings would have undergone the criticism of his companions and perhaps would have been reworked in a more conventional, restrained, and less personal style which, in turn, would have transmitted far less expressively what he wished to say. But Avvakum, alone and unschooled in literary techniques, did the major part of his writing in the absence of critics, and thereby avoided any such influence. During his literarily creative years in the prison of Pustozersk, Avvakum's sole contact with learned Muscovite society was with Deacon Feodor, from whom, however, the Protopope became implacably alienated over controversies about dogma.

Thus compelled to seek out a literary pattern suitable for the expression of his ideas, Avvakum resorted to the vocabulary and style of the milieu in which he had lived, to the expressions and words familiar to him since his boyhood. Except for his short contact with Muscovite society, Avvakum had never lived among the learned men of his time. He was much more closely associated with the lower urban groups, the peasantry, Muscovite administrative officials (podiachie), and the lower, non-monastic clergy. Most of his life was spent in villages and small towns throughout Central and Northern Russia, in half-colonized Siberia, in prison and in exile, rather than in monasteries and libraries. His life companions were not such Muscovite erudite men as Arseny the Deaf, Ivan Nasedka, Nikita Druzhinin, Arseny Sukhanov, or Feodor Griboedov, but merchants, clergymen, military men, and clerks, and it was the language of the latter group, which formed the pattern of the Protopope's writing.[86] His persecution, imprisonment, and isolation, with their unique experiences and perspectives, forced the Protopope to create independently and brought into being this great writer of Muscovy who under other circumstances might never have found such a calling.

Avvakum's lack of a regular literary training is particularly evident in his mode of composition. He follows a definite plan in

relating his adventures and sufferings and also in his dogmatic discourses and petitions, but he does not adhere strictly to his subject. He interrupts himself frequently with lengthy digressions, and his explosions of passion and wrath infringe upon the unity of his narrative. But his remarkable gift for observation, his concise sentences and skillful self-expression, as well as the precision of his remarks, make the reader forgive the imperfections of composition.

Isolated from the world, constantly meditating upon the fate of Russia and Orthodoxy, Avvakum in his cell digested his previous reading and experiences and produced original works which, though demonstrably connected with preceding literary traditions, constitute an important new stage in the development of Russian letters. The Protopope himself said of his writing that it was the result of ponderous deliberations during his sleepless nights: "What I gather during the night, I scatter during the day." Most of his writing should be considered a recording of undelivered oral diatribes and sermons, of praises and philippics. The impact on his manner of writing of enforced isolation from his habitual society is particularly reflected in his letters. As long as he maintained personal contact with society, his letters were more conventional, more literary, and less passionate, but with imprisonment there grew a greater spontaneity of feeling and vividness of expression. His petitions to Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich, written in Moscow during his last stay there, are framed in a reserved style, while his last letters to this same Tsar, to the Tsar's son Feodor, and to the Boyarinya Morozova, run the entire gamut of the Protopope's unrestrained emotions and contain a greater proportion of colloquialisms.[87]

It is important to note that Avvakum's stylistic and linguistic peculiarities, which arose from the need to create his own literary pattern, were not regarded by his traditionalistic and conservative followers as a revolutionary novelty, for they themselves spoke the same language and used it in their own private correspondence and notes. The letters of Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich, of Morozova, the nobleman Leontiev, and Deacon Feodor are also written in the same language as the Protopope's.[88] Like Avvakum, his contemporaries interspersed their discussions of religion, life, and politics with quotations from the Scriptures and Holy Fathers. The resulting picturesque speech, composed of the popular tongue and some Church Slavonic words and figures of speech, was preserved by the Old Believers late into the nineteenth century. The heroes of Melnikov-Pechersky's novels In the

Forests and On the Mountains, as well as the Old Believers' writings of the last century, use almost the same speech as the Protopope two hundred years earlier. This rich but simple language, understandable to every Russian of the time, was one of the principle reasons for Avvakum's success as a preacher and writer, one of the main sources of the beauty of his writings and of his popularity in his day.[89] The intelligibility of his language and style made his writings accessible not only to the educated strata of Russian society but also to the whole of the Russian people. Among the peasantry and the urban population of seventeenth-century Moscovy there were many literate people, and these plain Russian readers formed the bulk of Avvakum's followers.[90]

V

A gift for observation and description, profound knowledge of human nature, and an excellent command of spoken Russian made Avvakum a penetrating writer. These qualities enabled him to create the first artistic portraits in Russian literature and are the key to his literary individuality. No writer before Avvakum and none for almost a century after his death left such a brilliant example of Russian prose. His ability at depicting people and their actions is unsurpassed in Russian letters until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Protopope succeeded in picturing the attitudes and behavior of his contemporaries and himself in short dialogues and graphic accounts of their actions, presented in simple sentences unburdened with rhetorical ornament.

Avvakum's exile in Siberia, shared by his wife, his return to Moscow and his conversations with the Protopopitsa[91] were for Avvakum an excellent background for the first vivid portrayal of a faithful and morally strong Russian woman. For the first time in Russian literature a woman appeared as a companion to her husband in life and through torments and as an unfailing supporter in times of distress. In 1663, upon Avvakum's return to Moscow from his first exile, grave doubts as to the use of further opposition to the reforms of Nikon overcame him, and in this moment of despair and desolation the Protopope found firm support in the words of his exhausted but still staunch wife. He states:

> Seeing my distress, the Protopopitsa approached with deference and said to me, 'What troubles you, my lord?' And I explained everything to her. 'Wife, what should I do? The world is embraced by the blight of heresy. Should I speak or stay silent? I am shackled.' But she replied, 'God forgive ! What are you say-

> ing, Petrovich? I know the word of the Apostles, as do you yourself: Art thou bound to a wife, seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from the wife, seek no wife. I and the children give you our blessing. Dare to preach the word of God as fearlessly as before, and do not be concerned about us. As long as God allows it, we shall stay together. If we are separated, then do not forget us in your prayers. Christ is mighty and will not abandon us. Go. Go to church, Petrovich, and denounce the corruption of the heretics.' For these words, I bowed to her, and having shaken off my grievous blindness I resumed preaching the word of God as before, teaching in the cities and everywhere, and boldly denouncing the Nikonian heresy.[92]

Avvakum's mother, in accordance with Russian custom, chose his wife, the orphaned daughter of a blacksmith. They were married while both were still very young, and during the Protopopitsa's entire life she remained a staunch, true friend and comrade to her husband. She followed Avvakum to Moscow during the few months of his success there as a preacher and remained with him throughout the trying years of exile in Siberia, where he was sent as an army priest with the troops commanded by Afanasy Pashkov. She and Avvakum came to realize that hardships would follow them all their lives; they were together during most of the difficult moments of Avvakum's life, except for the years of Pustozersk imprisonment. In Siberia, in the course of a particularly difficult trek across the ice, the Protopopitsa on one occasion collapsed, utterly exhausted, and asked her husband, "How long shall we suffer these torments, Protopope?" To Avvakum's resigned reply, "Until our very death, Markovna," she answered, "Well, Petrovich, let us continue."[93]

The Protopopitsa, Avvakum's steadfast companion, is not the only woman to appear in his writing. In his autobiography he refers to Boyarinya Feodosia Morozova and her sister, Princess Evdokia Urusova, who were his loyal supporters at the court of the Tsar and who later died as martyrs for the Old Belief. In Avvakum's letters to these sisters we find a moving and lyrical portrait of the Boyarinya Morozova, whom the Protopope particularly venerated. This portrait is composed in an elevated style with extensive use of Church Slavonic words and the traditional metaphors from ecclesiastical literature; it strongly resembles the traditional hagiographic writings.[94] Much of the rhetorical description is unusual for Avvakum and is almost iconographic in its solemnity and dramatic style. The "boyar's widow, with entree at Court, and a close friend of the Tsaritsa," is

crowned with the halo of Orthodox sainthood. The characteristics of Morozova given by Avvakum are especially striking because her "halo of sainthood" is contrasted with down-to-earth descriptions of her life and surroundings before her imprisonment. This portrait is one of the most interesting pieces of Avvakum's entire work, though difficult to translate because of the contrast of "iconographic" details offered in conventional literary Church Slavonic and the parts written in vernacular Russian. It is a masterpiece of workmanship in the combination of these two styles, and stands out not only as one of the finest fragments of Russian letters but as one of the best works of Eastern hagiographic literature as well.

In this letter to Morozova is included a paragraph describing the Old Believers' manner of making the sign of the cross, and this esthetic image of the spiritual symbol dear to every Orthodox is a gem in itself. The fact that Avvakum describes the sign of the cross in the way the Boyarinya herself performed it only increases the tribute which he pays her. She, like Avvakum, has been regarded as a saint by the Old Believers. Avvakum writes, admiring the beauty of the Orthodox way of praying, as follows: "And your fingers are most delicate and most expressive. The middle, fourth, and little fingers symbolize the Holy Trinity. You put together the thumb and the index finger, which are the image of the two natures of Christ—the divine and the human. You raise them to your forehead, lower them to your breast, and place them on each of your shoulders. While making the sign of the cross you kneel before the ikon of Christ, asking God to forgive your own sins and those of the world."[95] This description is so lyrical and offers such a harmonious juxtaposition of Church Slavonic and vernacular words that its effect is one of highly artistic prose and, like the whole letter, can hardly be satisfactorily translated.[96] This portrait also reveals what might be called Avvakum's esthetic approach to Orthodoxy and the artistic side of his admiration for Orthodox prayer and ritual.

Very often in his works Avvakum stresses the spiritual harmony and beauty of Orthodox rites, which he felt were endangered by the new secularizing trends in Russian society and its spiritual life. In this connection he remarked in his letter to Morozova, "They are ruining the beauty of our Mother Church, its harmony, and the dogma of the Holy Apostles and Holy Fathers."[97]

It may be noted that Avvakum's literary portraits of his wife and the Boyarinya Morozova have a place in Russian literature as the first in a gallery of famous characters who, in the nineteenth

century, contributed greatly to the reputation of Russian womanhood. Moral strength, faithfulness, and readiness to sacrifice oneself have been the common features of Russian women in literature, beginning with the Protopopitsa and Morozova in the work of Avvakum, and culminating in Pushkin's Captain's Daughter and Tatiana, and in Turgenev's Natalia and Liza.

In presenting his heroes Avvakum introduced a technique previously unknown in Russian literature. The literary portraits left by Ivan Timofeev and Feodor Griboedov consist of lengthy descriptions of the moral quality of their characters and offer readers a stylized hero.[98] But Avvakum, with the sole exception of the hagiographic image of Boyarinya Morozova, let his characters live and depict themselves by their own actions. He does not picture them as villainous or virtuous types nor describe them with laudatory or uncomplimentary adjectives, and he often even refrains from giving his own judgment of them. Of Pashkov, the Siberian conquistador who was Avvakum's guardian during his first exile and who plagued the Protopope for ten long years, for instance, Avvakum remarks, "Ten years he tormented me, or perhaps, I, him; I do not know. God will decide it on the Great Day."[99]

The portraits of Avvakum himself, of Pashkov, the Tsar, the Protopopitsa, and Morozova, of soldiers, jailers, and the demon-possessed form a gallery of the multifarious types of seventeenth-century Muscovites and constitute the first artistic presentation of Russian society. Avvakum's heroes appear on the pages of his book in the natural setting of their Russian villages and cities, palaces and jails, in a Church assembly and on a Siberian expedition. Pashkov's Siberian campaign presented the Protopope with an opportunity to describe the majestic beauty of the Siberian wilderness and life in this remote corner of the Muscovite empire, as well as to give a dramatic and poignant account of the terrible hardships endured by the participants in the Russian drive toward the Pacific. Endless marches, the soldiers' hunger, deprivation, the cruelty of Pashkov and the Protopope's own sufferings are transmitted so vividly that the reader actually feels the difficulties of this expedition. The pages devoted to the Siberian period of Avvakum's life display the Propopope's inborn gift for observation and his ability at description.

Avvakum never speaks of Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich at any length, but the Tsar's relationship with Avvakum is clear from the short, scattered remarks in the Zhitie. Relating his meeting with the Tsar, he stressed the Tsar's esteem for him

and the sovereign's repeated request that Avvakum give him his blessing and pray for him.[100] Even after Avvakum's final break with the Church the Tsar refused to consent to the Protopope's execution. As long as Alexey Mikhaylovich was alive the Protopope, although exposed to many hardships in the Pustozersk prison, was never tortured. But it is easy to sense that the Tsar, despite his personal attachment to the old traditions and admiration for the Protopope's faith and integrity, still disapproved of Avvakum's refractoriness. During their first interview after Avvakum's return from exile in 1663 the Tsar welcomed him, but hearing of Avvakum's reluctance to define his future attitude the Tsar "left him and hastened away."[101] When Avvakum resumed his propagandizing and sharply attacked the hierarchy in petitions to the Tsar, Alexey Mikhaylovich finally became angry with him.[102] An experienced statesman, the Tsar could not approve the intransigent attitude of the conservative opposition. His sympathies were aligned with traditional ideology, and he willingly postponed the reforms; but after the Church Council's decision to carry out the reforms—a decision agreed to even by the Eastern patriarchs —the Tsar gave his final support to the Church administration. He felt that the Old Believers' attempt to alter the nation's evolution was based on a historical illusion, and he preferred to maintain the balance between conservatism and necessary progress. As a strong personality profoundly devoted to his ideals, Avvakum attracted the Tsar, and in the most difficult period before the Protopope's final condemnation the Tsar went to him in the monastery in which the recalcitrant opponent of reform was imprisoned. Although the Tsar intended to talk with the Protopope, he was probably undecided whether he should allow a personal interview, for Avvakum's hopes might thus have been encouraged. "He walked around the cell, sighed, and left the monastery" without seeing Avvakum.[103] The Protopope himself respected and even loved the "most quiet" Tsar and, like most of the Old Believers, attributed the reform of the Church books to the dissenters' enemies, who, they felt, had deceived and won over the Tsar. From his underground cell, which can be likened to an earthen coffin, Avvakum wrote to Morozova, who by that time was also in prison, "I saw him—my dear sovereign—for the last time when I gave him Communion. Let him be. God wants it so. And you should not sorrow over him, either. What Christ decides is just."[104]

VI

The entire literary work of Avvakum is dominated by a hero who outweighs all other characters in his writings. This is the Protopope himself, the main personage of the autobiography and of his "Talks," letters, and dogmatic works. There are few writings in world literature as a whole which present such a frank and colorful picture of their authors as does the Protopope's Zhitie.

In the beginning of his Zhitie Avvakum gives a short relation of his own early religious experience which is at the same time the first description of a man's spiritual formation in Russian literature. He writes: "My father was addicted to intoxicating drink, but my mother always prayed and fasted and taught me the fear of God. Once I saw a neighbor's animal fall dead, and the same night I awoke and wept before the ikon, sorrowing for my soul and meditating upon my own death, because, likewise, I too would die. Since that time I have become accustomed to praying every night."[105] In this laconic, somewhat dry revelation of the basis for his spiritual development, the Protopope explains how the example of his father and the deeply religious atmosphere with which his mother surrounded him were accountable for the formation of his feeling of responsibility for the salvation of his soul. The dissoluteness of his father and of Avvakum's milieu aroused in the child an aversion for sin, and this aversion conditioned all his later life and activity. His mother's teachings, at the same time, instilled in him a deep faith in God, a faith which always supported him and to which he remained constant to the very end of his life. He experienced a vision of death which awakened his realization of the mystery of life and of the necessity to prepare himself for final judgment. It is very probable that this first encounter with death, which deeply affected his sensitive nature and conditioned his early religious life, gave a strongly tragic coloration to his later eschatological concepts. Expectation of the coming end of the world and preparedness for death were among the prime bases of Old Believer thought and were to a great degree accountable for the rapidity with which their teachings spread.[106] No other Old Believer was able to present so simply and naturally the relationship between one's spiritual responsibility for oneself and for the souls of others as was Avvakum.

The Protopope exemplified strict observance of moral precepts and intense prayer. Every evening he read the recommended prayers and upon retiring always observed the "Rule of Obei-

sance." "I did three hundred bows, six hundred 'Prayers of Jesus,' and one hundred prayers to the Mother of God, and my wife did two hundred bows and only four hundred prayers because she had to care for the children, who were crying."[107] Avvakum recommended such prayer to his friends and flock, remarking, "And be happy when you get up in the night, and do three hundred bows and seven hundred prayers joyfully and with spiritual gladness."[108]

In the church the Protopope prolonged the service, insisting on a careful, clear pronunciation of each word; and he loved to explain the significance of the ritual and the meaning of the teachings of Christ. His treatises are interesting examples of his method. In a colorful and simple manner, at times perhaps even too colloquial, Avvakum discusses Church beliefs and the content of the Testament, illustrating his explanation with examples from everyday life. He brings the religious problem within the understanding of the plain Russian man. Like Father Ivan Neronov and other Zealots of Piety, in his parish Avvakum introduced the sermon as an important element of the service, and he made the church not only a place of worship but also a school for Christian education.

A call for moral revival and the struggle against debauchery and corruption dominated Avvakum's preaching in the early period of his activity as priest, in the years 1642-1653. In the realm of morals he was no less uncompromising than in that of dogma and ritual. During the early years of his priesthood, before he became absorbed in the defense of the old books and ritual, his homilies were largely exhortations for moral decency and denunciations of immorality and extravagance; they brought him innumerable difficulties. He required strict behavior from his parishioners; he never hesitated to expose and stigmatize, when they were guilty, even the administrators upon whom he himself depended. His uncompromising attitude earned him repeated conflicts with corrupt local officials, endangering his position and even his very life. In his first parish his admonitions led to a violent clash with a local chief of administration who had abused the daughter of a widow. The officer, enraged by Avvakum's public accusation, physically assaulted the priest in the church, beat him, and dragged him about on the floor.[109] One conflict with representatives of the local authorities followed another because the Protopope was quick to speak out when evidence of dissoluteness or injustice came to his attention. His parishioners often revolted against the severe priest, and on one occasion his house was attacked by a mob bent upon killing him.[110] His position radically changed when he went to Moscow and found the protection of the Tsar and of the Zealots

of Piety. In the capital Avvakum's strict life won him the veneration of society and he became a preferred spiritual counsellor and one of Moscow's most popular preachers. Aristocracy and the common people alike sought his help, reproofs, and consolation.

For his opposition to Patriarch Nikon's reforms Avvakum was exiled in 1653 to Siberia. The ten years of this first exile only reinforced his moral strength and intensity. Returning to Moscow in 1664 as a mature forty-four-year-old priest, Avvakum became the leader of traditionalist circles in the capital and fought tenaciously against reform and new foreign influences in Russian life. In Mezen and later in Pustozersk, where he was sent in 1667, the cell of Avvakum became the center of the Old Believers' resistance. Despite close surveillance, the letters and messages of the Protopope continued to buoy the spirit of opposition. In these most difficult years of his life Avvakum developed his talent as a writer and created, besides his autobiography, a large number of polemical and theological works. At that time the appeals of Avvakum met with success among the people, and his strict life, fre frequent fasting, and continuous prayer won him the reputation of a holy man and martyr. After his death Avvakum was recognized as a saint by the dissenters, and for two and one-half centuries the severe face of the Protopope continued to watch over, from ikons, the prayers of the Old Believers.

Untamed in his sermons and in debate, the Protopope was equally unrestrained in his prayer. In the Pustozersk prison he continued his life of devotion with even greater persistence and passion. In a moment of religious ecstasy he would lose his awareness of physical reality, and he would feel that he had mystically overcome the world. Once, after a long and severe fast, he became so weak that he was unable to pray aloud and only mentally continued to repeat his prayers. He relates in a letter to Tsar Alexey:

> With the blessing of God, on the night of Friday in the second week of fasting my tongue suddenly began to grow, my teeth became big, and my legs and arms swelled, and all of me became wide and spread over the sky and along all of the earth. Then God placed in me the sky and the earth and all creation. I continued to pray and count my beads. This lasted about half an hour or more. Afterwards I arose easily from my couch and bowed to the ground before God. After this visit of God I began to eat bread for the Lord's glory. Do you understand it, my sovereign? You, living in freedom, possess only the Russian land, while the Son

> of God gave me as a reward for my imprisonment the earth and the sky.... The heavens and the earth, light and creation are mine because God gave them to me.[111]

Such moments of mystical ecstasy increased Avvakum's spiritual strength and prepared him to face a martyr's death with joy and peace. On Easter, reciting the Gospel from memory and standing almost naked on the icy floor of his cell, he felt suddenly that his guardian angel was at his side, smiling at him. At that moment a vision of the Mother of God and Jesus Christ appeared to the Protopope from the clouds.[112]

Mysticism, a feeling of direct communion with God and a feeling of assurance of His continuing grace, did not lead Avvakum away from the life of the world. His strict existence and endless prayer never made him an adherent of self-mortification or an anchorite, and he was not one of the family of great Eastern ascetics. In seeking in religion the way to Man's salvation, Avvakum did not sever his relations with the world and men. On the contrary, as we have seen, during his imprisonment he started to write, precisely in order to keep in contact with the world and help it find the way to salvation. Earthly life was always as close and dear to him as was mystical contact with the life eternal. Day-by-day life, the family, his flock, and his nation had for him an independent and important value, and this was one of the reasons why even in Pustozersk he remained deeply interested in society, doing everything possible to influence the further development of his people, and why he became a writer.

Evil and wicked forces had for Avvakum a material nature. Evil appeared to him in the form of the very fiends themselves; when he laid eyes upon them, he would attempt to chase them away and chastise them, just as he would punish a disobedient member of his flock or a recalcitrant domestic animal. For example, Avvakum recounts that once when he had succeeded in driving out the fiend from a man possessed, the devil fled to the windowsill. When the Protopope sprinkled it with holy water, the devil hid himself in the corner, and upon being chased from there it found refuge on the stove.[113] The Protopope had frequent occasion to drive out devils from the possessed, and he reports that he never failed to free the possessed from the fiend![114]

The Protopope's demands upon the Orthodox went further than observance of the moral code and regular prayer and understanding of the teachings of Christ. He wanted them to accept the responsibility for their own personal salvation as well as for that

of the world, and to exemplify the Christian life. When he selected Morozova as an example for Orthodox behavior, he praised her for her Christian life and her charity.[115] Avvakum could not be satisfied merely with overt goodness but demanded readiness to sacrifice oneself before God and to help those in need.

The Protopope waged an unceasing struggle for the preservation of the Old Russian traditions, sacrificing his life, his family, and even the unity of the Russian Church and of his beloved country. He did not spare himself, nor was he restrained by bonds of self-control or self-preservation. During the Church Council of 1666-67 when the Russian Orthodox hierarchy and the Eastern patriarchs met to decide the future of the reforms proposed by Patriarch Nikon, Avvakum boldly attacked the Eastern clergy: "Your Orthodoxy has become motley because of the Turkish Mahomet, and it is not at all strange that you have become so weak. You should therefore come to us and learn from us. Our state is sovereign by the grace of God.... Only the wolf, Nikon, with a devil in him, has taken to making the sign of the cross with three fingers."[116] Avvakum incensed the Council against him with these accusations and other offenses. To demonstrate further his disdain toward the gathering, the Protopope lay down upon the floor before the door of the assembly hall.[117] Condemning the enemies of the Old Belief, he himself forgot the teachings of Christ and urged, in his petition to the Tsar, their merciless extermination. "If you would only give me freedom to do what I want, my lord and Tsar, I would dismember them in one day like the prophet Elias. First we would cleave asunder Nikon, then the Nikonians."[118] Small wonder this petition led him to the stake. Such emotional outcries continuously interrupt the Protopope's letters, treatises, and his autobiography, and constantly reveal the forthrightness of his state of mind.

Though merciless toward the enemies of the Church, the Protopope was not rancorous toward his own personal enemies. As we have seen, he forgave his worst persecutor, Pashkov, and referred to God the final judgment as to which of them was most responsible for their strife.[119]

In accordance with the practice of the time, Avvakum favored the application of physical punishment for sins, and often the members of his family felt the mighty hand of the priest. But when after reconsideration his penalty seemed to him unjust, he requested that he himself be punished. Once, after having treated his wife unjustly in a fit of temper, he came into the hands of a

possessed man who lived in chains in his house. Excited by Avvakum's severity toward his wife, the man administered upon the Protopope a terrible beating, and Avvakum not only accepted this as deserved but commanded each of the twenty members of his household to give him five lashes. This demonstration of humility and repentance, Avvakum reports, even cured the possessed man, who was abandoned by the fiend.[120]

The early period of Avvakum's life and teachings has been largely disregarded by historians. While the last thirty years of his life, from 1653 to 1682, were devoted primarily to defense of the Old Russian tradition and to combatting reform, his early years were devoted entirely to a Christian revival within the Church and the nation. His opposition to the reform, indeed, arose from the understanding which he had gained in his early life of Russia's spiritual heritage. He sought to solve the state's and the Church's problems by imbuing Russian life with the spirit of Orthodoxy and bringing about a revival of Christianity; but he rejected most decisively changes in any details of the ritual and violently attacked any change of the canons sanctified for centuries by the worship of Russian saints, clergy, and laity. The Church hierarchy, supported by the state, insisted on formal change of the letter of the ritual, forgetting and abandoning the traditional spirit of Russian Orthodoxy. To Avvakum this purely legalistic textual reform of the books seemed indefensible. Back of the conflict against the formal changes in the ritual was, as a matter of fact, a struggle for the primacy of the spirit over the letter. Avvakum's aversion toward the foreign and "Latin" spirit was a reflection of the eternal contrast between what he felt to be the Eastern, mystical approach to Christianity and the formal, legalistic concept of the Latin West. For the spirit of Orthodox Russia as he understood it, Avvakum died in the flames, exhorting the terrified crowd to remain true to the Old Russian way of making the sign of the cross and to the ancient Orthodox tradition. His last words from the flames were, "Brethren, pray always with this sign of the cross and you will never die, but you shall perish if you abandon it."

VII

By demonstrating the esthetic flexibility of the Russian language and offering to the Russian reader the first realistic descriptions and vivid character portrayals, the Protopope became the creator of an artistic Russian prose. Avvakum was closely

bound to the previous evolution of Russian letters; he did not break with the literary traditions of his time but furnished Russian letters with new tools for the perfection of literary endeavor. And in his propagation of Old Believer thought he created the finest works in Muscovite literature. His writings climaxed the development of Muscovite letters and are an achievement in the establishment of certain new techniques in Russian literature. But Avvakum was neither an iconoclast nor a product of the disintegration of Muscovite society; on the contrary, he was deeply attached to the old Muscovite tradition and proved that even within the bounds of this tradition an artistic literary perfection could be attained. His mind was conditioned not only by the society of his time but also by the entire development of Russia's culture and spiritual life during the two and one-half centuries of the growth of Muscovy. All the component elements of his writing can be found in the works of his predecessors. He only sharpened these tools and thereby carried Russian letters to a height previously unattained.

Such a man as Avvakum should have greatly influenced the further development of Russian literature, but, unfortunately for Muscovite letters, its greatest writer was one of its last. The subsequent cultural evolution of Russia throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries subdued his impact on the course of Russian literary history, and by an irony of fate Avvakum himself was even instrumental in the downfall of Muscovite traditions. By leading away a great number of Orthodox traditionalists from the Church and from the life of the Russian state, he weakened the influence which these conservative members of Muscovite society could have had upon the nation. Through championing the Old Believers' movement and the resultant schism in the Church, Avvakum excluded himself from participation in the later evolution of Russian society, and instead of finding his place in history as a great writer among Russians he was remembered for two centuries as only the leader of a religious minority.

From the beginning of the raskol up to the middle of the eighteenth century the Great Russians (Velikorossy), weakened by the schism, played only a minor role in the literary and cultural life of the empire. For almost a hundred years—the second half of the seventeenth and first part of the eighteenth centuries—Great Russian participation in the newly Westernized culture of the Russian empire was reduced to an insignificant proportion. Most Great Russian thinkers and learned men remained faithful to the conservative Russian Orthodox tradition and stood apart from the

further evolution of the nation. Almost all of the Great Russian writers of importance in the seventeenth century were Old Believers—for example, Avvakum, Deacon Feodor, Nikita, Druzhinin, Spiridon Potemkin. Karion Istomin, Silvester Medvedev, and Peter Kvashnin,[121] who also lacked influence in the established church and in the increasingly Westernized society, were the few Great Russians who participated in the cultural evolution desired by the state. Far more active in the spiritual development of the Muscovite state after the first signs of Westernization were "Catholic-minded" South and West Russian monks from Polotsk and Kiev—Simeon Polotsky, Arseny Satanovsky, Epifany Slavinetsky and Damaskin Ptitsky.[122] In the early eighteenth century the proportion of Great Russians who took part in the cultural and spiritual life of the newly created, Westernized Russian empire continued to diminish. Tatishchev and Pososhkov were the only two Great Russians of high caliber among the educated collaborators of Peter the Great, but even they had little impact on their contemporaries, and their works were not published till long after their death.[123] The nation's literary stage, too, became dominated by South Russian monks and German versifiers. Feofan Prokopovich, Dimitry Tuptalo (Bishop of Rostov), Stefan Yavorsky, Prince Antioch Kantemir, Mons, and Paus, all South Russians (Ukrainians), Germans, or Moldavians were the writers and spiritual leaders of the cosmopolitan society of the Petrinian empire, while the Old Believers, the last representatives of Great Russian Muscovite culture, were harassed into the forests and marshes.[124]

In the first half of the eighteenth century the same situation of the subordination of Great Russians prevailed in the schools and in the Church, the former nursery of Great Russian gens de lettres. After the death of the last patriarch, Adrian, in 1700, an ever-increasing number of South Russian (Ukrainian) bishops were nominated to the sees, and they continued to constitute the majority in the high Church administration from the organization of the Holy Synod in 1722 until the time of Catherine II. The Church hierarchy itself was made up predominantly of Kievan monks.[125] In the schools the reign of German educators and South or West Russian monks was undisputed, while under Peter and Empresses Ann and Elizabeth, Germans or Ukrainians played a leading role even in the state administration. South Russian and foreign influence had an effect on literature as well. The Great Russian vernacular and Muscovite Church Slavonic gave way to a new literary language dominated by foreign borrowings and South

Russian morphological and stylistic features,[126] while South Russian and West European literary genres completely dislodged the former Muscovite patterns.

The entire development of Russian literature and culture during the imperial period was the product of co-operation among the three branches of the Russian people—the Great Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians. It would not be exaggerated however to assume that the early stage of this development was largely the work, not of the Great Russians but of their western and southern brothers, the Ukrainians and Belorussians. Even the ideology of the Petrinian empire was the result of the writings of Simeon Polotsky and Feofan Prokopovich. Polotsky's poem The Russian Eagle and Prokopovich's funeral oration at the burial of Peter the Great were the most convincing expressions of their belief in the need for a powerful, unified Russian empire.

Only during the reigns of Empresses Elizabeth and Catherine the Great did the Great Russians begin to participate more actively in the cultural life of the Russian Empire. The pioneers in this activity were Lomonosov in the sciences, Sumarokov in literature, Bishops Dimitry Sechenov and Gedeon Krinovsky in the church and seminaries, and Shuvalov and Popovsky in education. Soon the Great Russians gained the dominant role in the cultural life of the state, and with the growth of Russia's new Western culture the period of cultural interregnum came to an end. A new literature arose, based on the Great Russian language and augmented by borrowings from the Kievan literary tongue, and the nineteenth century witnessed the flourishing of Russian letters and culture.

In the eighteenth century the Old Russian cultural heritage and literature were almost entirely forgotten—so much so that Pushkin was prompted to remark that "Karamzin discovered Old Russia as Columbus discovered America."[127] This neglect limited the literary impact of Avvakum, so that it was felt during that century only in the writings of the Old Believers—Russia's internal exiles—themselves, while Westernized literary circles granted little importance to the writings of the Protopope and his fellow-believers.

The literature of the Old Believers, however, did not die despite the Westernization of the major part of educated Russian society. It continued to develop underground, carrying on the tradition of Avvakum, whose unchallenged authority determined for many years its spirit, genre, and style. As long ago as the 1670's some of Avvakum's contemporaries, profoundly impressed by the

power of his literary creations, to a great extent imitated his writings. His prison mate and confessor, the monk Epifany, who encouraged Avvakum to write his Zhitie, also followed the Protopope's pattern when he wrote his own autobiography.[128] This work closely reflects the style and language of Avvakum and is a most interesting document on the religious life of a Muscovite monk. An anonymous author belonging to the Old Believers' circle in Moscow also wrote a biography of Boyarinya Morozova in which he adhered closely to the characteristics exhibited by Avvakum in his letters.[129] But most of the Old Believers of the years 1650-1680 were less influenced by the style and language of Avvakum than by his plea to remain faithful to the prevailing traditions of Old Russia; they are less exuberant, drier, and more conservative in their works.

The next generation of dissenters, represented primarily by Father Evfrosin, reintroduced in their writings the intricate style of the vitiistvo. The Vyga school, which furnished the only valuable examples of early eighteenth-century Russian prose and is best represented by the brothers Denisov and Ivan Filippov,[130] accentuated still more the element of the ornate in the Old Believers' writings. Along with the ornate style, however, the Old Believers continued to employ the Russian colloquial vocabulary and grammatical forms which Avvakum had utilized so profusely, and they developed narrative as a literary genre. In spirit and in their attitude toward the Russian church and toward state and cultural problems, they remained faithful to the legacy of Avvakum. For more than two centuries the Old Believers preserved the ancient Muscovite traditions, and even in the twentieth century, the Metropolitan Innokenty, V. P. Ryabushinsky, I. Kirillov, and F. E. Melnikov have reflected in their writings the language, style, and spirit of the great Protopope.

Avvakum's impact on nineteenth- and twentiety-century Russian literature would make an interesting subject for detailed study. In the nineteenth century some writers, such as D. L. Mordovtsev[131] and D. S. Merezhkovsky, [132] devoted whole works to Avvakum, making substantial borrowings from the topics and language of the Zhitie. Dostoevsky, particularly in The Brothers Karamazov, introduced some themes and characters which might easily have been inspired by Avvakum's autobiography. In the story of the religious formation of Alyosha Karamazov there is much that is similar to the early spiritual development of Avvakum himself,[133] and in the visions of Father Ferapont may be found close counterparts with the "almost domesticated" devils

of Avvakum and Epifany.[134] Leskov in his Sealed Angel describes the Old Believers of the nineteenth century, whose spiritual world is still the same as Avvakum's, and his conservative, individual, untamed, and deeply religious characters of The Cathedral Folk are reminiscent of the strong and colorful figures of the Protopope and his circle. In the twentieth century the works of Maximilian Voloshin, Shmelev, Remizov, and Leonov[135] are also indebted to Avvakum's language, style, and imagery.

There can be little doubt that interest in Avvakum's writing has grown since his works again became available, and that his writings will continue to attract the attention of our contemporaries. The literary talent of this unusual personality will win for him in Russian literary history and in the hearts of Russian and Western readers the place due this great Old Believer.

Notes

1. The Russian term "protopope," which became a part of Avvakum's literary name, should be translated as "archpriest": it is an honorary title of distinction granted a priest. A protopope was usually rector of the main church of a city, supervisor of the clergy in a smaller district, or vicar to the bishop.

2. The exact dates of Avvakum's birth and death are not known. P. I. Mel'nikov, the first scholarly biographer of Avvakum, places the date of his birth between 1605 and 1610, and gives April 1, 1681, for the date of death (see P. I. Mel'nikov, "Avvakum Petrovich," Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Petersburg, Moscow, [c. 1900], VII, 376, 382). Pierre Pascal, author of an excellent biography of the Protopope, suggests November 25, 1620, as the date of birth and April 14, 1682, for his death (P. Pascal, Avvakum et les débuts du raskol [Paris, 1938], pp. 75, 545). Also see S. Denisov, "Istoriia o otsekh i stradal'tsekh solovetskikh," in Raskolnichii dela 18-ogo stoletiia, ed. Esipov (Petersburg, 1861), II, 46; and P. S. Smirnov, Vnutrennie voprosy v raskole 18-ago veka (Petersburg, 1898), No. 10, p. 8. April 14, 1682, seems the most probable date of Avvakum's death.

3. Of Avvakum's writings, a large number of manuscript copies, dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, have been preserved; see Druzhinin, Pisaniia russkikh staroobriadtsev (Petersburg, 1912), p. 131, and Pamiatniki istorii staroobriadchestva 17-ogo veka (Leningrad, 1927), I, 3-4 (called Pamiatniki below). Quite recently, in the 1940's, V. I. Malyshev discovered twenty-five new manuscript copies of Avvakum's Zhitie, and several of these manuscripts date from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see V. M. Malyshev, "Zametka o rukopisnykh spiskakh Zhitiia prot. Avvakuma," in Trudy Otdela drevne-russkoi

literatury [hereafter abbreviated as TODRL] [Moscow, 1951], VIII). Malyshev was even fortunate enough to find new, hitherto unknown pages of Zhitie (ibid., pp. 385-388). Malyshev states that as late as 1937-1938 the memory of an address once delivered by Avvakum was still alive in Northern Russia (V. I. Malyshev, "Ust Tsilemskoe predanie o protopope Avvakume," TODRL, VI, 372): an old inhabitant of the village Ust Tsilemskoe remembered the oral tradition that Avvakum, passing through the hamlet, urged the population to remain faithful to the Old Russian way of making the sign of the cross, with two fingers, and said "keep it, don't abandon it."

4. Despite the fact that Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich (1645-1676) consented to the Church hierarchy's condemnation of Avvakum, the Tsar never lost his respect for the Protopope. As long as he lived he opposed Avvakum's execution, which took place during the reign of his son, Tsar Feodor (1676-1682).

5. Members of the established church were called "Nikonians"by the Old Believers, because they accepted the reforms introduced by the Patriarch Nikon. The Nikonians were regarded by the Old Believers as being heretics and impure; in some instances Old Believers even feared that contact with the Nikonians would contaminate them. If a Nikonian visited in the home of an Old Believer, the things he touched, particularly dishes, would be carefully washed and the room would be fumigated with incense to cleanse the air of even the breath of the "heretic."

6. N. Ivanovskii, Rukovodstvo po istorii i oblecheniu staroobriadchestkago raskola (Kazan, 1897), pp. 234-250. The regulations of 1858 to a considerable degree eased the situation of the Old Believers, but only under Alexander III, in 1883, did they receive all civil rights. In 1905 they received final equality with members of the established church.

7. The first edition of Avvakum's Zhitie was published in 1859-1860 by N. S. Tikhonravov, in his Letopis' russkoi literatury i drevnostei, VI.

8. The second edition of the Zhitie was published by D. E. Kozhanchikov in 1862 in Petersburg. The best editions of Protopope Avvakum's works are: (1) in Materialy po istorii raskola, ed. by N. Subotin (Moscow, 1874-1890), I, V, VIII (called below Materialy), where most of Avvakum's important works are included; (2) in Pamiatniki pervykh let russkago staroobriadchestva, edited by Ia. L. Barskov, published as volume XXIV of Letopis' zaniatii Arkheograficheskoi komisii (Petersburg, 1912; called below Letopis'); (3) Zhitie Protopopa Avvakuma, a special Publication of the Archeographical Commission, ed. V.G. Druzhinin (Petrograd, 1916). It was the first critical and annotated complete edition of three (A,B, and V) versions of Avvakum's Life. These texts of Zhitie were entirely and without any alteration reproduced in Pamiatniki istorii staroobriadchestva 17-ogo veka, Vol.

I, No. 1 (Leningrad: Akademiia nauk, 1927) as Vol. XXXIX of Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka. In this last-mentioned volume were included most of Avvakum's writings. Some works attributed to him and also fragments of other of his works only partially preserved were to have been included in a second volume which has never appeared in print. This publication is the best collection of the Protopope's works. (4) Zhitie Protopopa Avvakuma im samim napisannoe i dr. sochinenia, ed. by N. K. Gudzii ("Academia," 1935); altogether there have been published eighteen Russian editions of Zhitie. The autobiography of Avvakum also appeared in English under the title The Life of Archpriest Avvakum, by Himself, translated by J. Harrison and H. Mirrlees (London, 1924), and in the collection, A Treasury of Russian Spirituality, ed. by G. P. Fedotov (New York, 1948), pp. 137-181, translated by H. Izvolsky. In this latter edition Avvakum's text is shortened and revised by the translator. References in this paper to the Zhitie and Avvakum's supplications and letters are to the last Paris edition of Zhitie and others of Avvakum's writings, published in 1951. This edition reproduces the Academy edition of 1916. The so-called "A" version of the Academy edition was taken as basis for the text. The additional texts of version "B" and "V" of the Academy edition were given in footnotes. In notes below, this Paris edition of the Zhitie is referred to as Avvakum.

9. The most important works on the role of Avvakum in the dissent are: N. Kapterev, Patriarkh Nikon i ego protivniki v dele ispravleniia tserkovnykh obriadov (Moscow, 1887, I, passim, particularly pp. 102-161 and 165-166); A. K. Borozdin, Protopop Avvakum (St. Petersburg, 1898); and V. O. Kliuchevskii, "Zapadnoe vliianie i tserkovnyi raskol v Rossii v 17-om veke," Ocherki i rechi (Moscow, 1913). On the movement of Zealots of Piety, see S. Zenkovsky, "Protopop Ivan Neronov," in (Paris) Vestnik, XXXI (1954), 11, 13-14.

10. G. Florovskii, Puti russkago bogosloviia (Paris, 1937), 57-67; A. V. Kartashov, "Smysl Staroobriadchestva," Sbornik statei posviashchennykh P. B. Struve (Prague, 1925), pp. 373-382; V. V. Zenkovsky, A History of Russian Philosophy (London, New York, 1953), I, 40-43. Very important is the above-mentioned work of Pascal (see note 2 above).

11. According to Old Russian and Old Believer legend, the city of Kitezh, because of the pious life led by its citizens, was spared by God during the Mongol invasion. It was preserved at the bottom of Lake Svetloyar, not far from Nizhny Novgorod (now Gorky). It is said that pious people can still hear the ringing of bells and the church service from the immersed city when they stand on the shore of the lake. Kitezh, according to the legend, continues to live its pious life beneath the water. The legend took its final version during the Time of Troubles, 1609-1617, and became a symbol of the Holy Kingdom in the minds of the Old Believers. See Mel'nikov, VII, 26-27; V. L. Komarovich, Kitezhskaia legenda (Leningrad, 1936), especially pp. 165, 167-171, 173; and A.

Gasitskii, "U nevidimago grada Kitezha," in Drevniaia i novaia Rossia (Moscow, 1877), III, 271. The Komsomolskaia Pravda (official organ of the Soviet Communist youth) December 18, 1953, reported that the shores of the Lake Svetloyar continue to be a place of popular religious pilgrimage.

12. Father G. Florovsky, pp. 58-80, gives a penetrating analysis of the eschatalogical motif in the Old Believers' thought of the seventeenth century. See also P. S. Smirnov, Vnutrennye Voprosy.

13. The standard Russian Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (Moscow: Brokhaus and Efron, 1890), I, 52-53, for instance, devotes to Avvakum only thirty lines, and does not even mention his literary work. It is interesting to contrast this sketchy information on Avvakum with an article on a nineteenth-century Arab chieftain in Algeria, Agd-el-Kader, to whom sixty-five lines were devoted. P. N. Polevoy in his monumental "Istoriia Russkoi slovesnosti (Petersburg, 1900), I, 293-294, devotes to Avvakum's writings only fifteen lines, stating that the Protopope offers a "true picture of contemporary habits and morals." The standard prerevolutionary textbook of Old Russian literature, V. Savodnik, Istoriia drevnei russkoi slovesnosti (Moscow, 1910), p. 269, is even more brief about Avvakum's literary value and simply notes that "his language is characterized by great power, expressiveness, and ardor." A. I. Nezelenov, Istoriia russkoi slovestnosti (Moscow, 1904), p. 122, treated "Avvakum, the main dissenter-writer" in five lines. The first more extensive analysis and appreciation of Avvakum's Zhitie was done by Alexander Brovkin, also known as Archimandrite Nikanor, Opisanie nekotorykh sochinenii napisannykh raskol'nikami (Petersburg, 1861), pp. 3-17, in which in spite of the polemical character of his work he recognizes that Avvakum's language "is not devoid of expressiveness and attractiveness" and "might strongly and dangerously influence the common man."

14. A. N. Pypin, Istoriia russkoi literatury (Moscow, 1898), III, 315-316.

15. V. V. Vinogradov, "O zadachakh stilistiki: Nabliudeniia nad stilem protopopa Avvakuma," in Russkaia rech' (Moscow, 1923), I, 195-293 (hereafter called Nabliudeniia).

16. V. V. Vinogradov distinguishes three main successive phases of the extension of the application of Biblical figurative language in the text of Avvakum: (1) the substitution of individual vernacular words for Church Slavonic words in Biblical texts; (2) the combining of whole Church Slavonic expressions with vernacular expressions; (3) the presentation of Biblical ideas in the pure vernacular (Nabliudeniia, pp. 227-229).

17. Kn. D. Sviatopolk Mirskii, "O Moskovskoi literature i protopope Avvakume v chastnosti," Evraziiskii vremennik, (Berlin, 1925), 338-350.

18. Ibid., p. 349.

19. Pamiatniki.

20. P. Chernykh, "Ocherki po istorii i dialektologii severno-velikorusskikh narechii: I: Zhitie prot. Avvakuma im samim napisannoe kak pamiatnik severno-velikorusskoi rechi 17-go stoletiia" (hereafter called "Ocherki"), in Sbornik trudov Irkutskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, XII (Irkutsk, 1927), 51-124.

21. N. K. Gudzii, ed., Zhitie Protopopa Avvakuma im samim napisannoe i dr. sochinenia (Moscow, 1935).

22. N. K. Gudzy, The History of Early Russian Literature (New York, 1949), pp. 386, 396. The first Russian edition of this book appeared in 1937.

23. Istoriia russkoi literatury, Vol. II, Part 2 (Moscow, Leningrad: Akademiia nauk, 1948), pp. 302-313 (hereafter this book is called IRL).

24. IRL, p. 312

25. IRL, pp. 306, 308.

26. IRL, pp. 308, 310, 311.

27. IRL, pp. 302.

28. IRL, pp. 321-322. F. Griboedov, an ancestor of the author of Gore ot uma, was a high official in the Muscovite state. He died in 1673. His work Istoriia o tsariakh i velikikh kniaziakh zemli Moskovskoi was published in Petersburg in 1896. See Pypin, II, 279, 480, 491.

29. A. A. Kaev, Russkaia literatura (Moscow, 1949), I, 286.

30. Avva Dorotheus' Instructions was published nine times in Russia: in Kiev in 1628, 1701, 1827, 1856, 1866, and 1909; three times in Moscow in 1652—four times in Latin, and five times in French. The last French edition in the translation of Abbé de Rance appeared in 1686. The style of Dorotheus is very close to that of Avvakum. Dorotheus mixed the elevated style of sermons with a light and secular style in the story of his own life. See Pascal, p. 485; IRL, p. 314.

31. Zhitie, 3rd version, Avvakum, p. 1, note.

32. Russian literature of the Kiev period used both Church Slavonic and the Russian vernacular. Some passages of the Primary Chronicle, particularly the juridical texts, are given almost entirely in the vernacular. The Testament of Vladimir Monomakh offers one of the most spectacular examples of the intermixture of the two styles. See P. P. Iakubinskii, Istoriia drevnerusskogo iazyka (Moscow, Leningrad, 1946), pp. 71-80, 125-131. On Vladimir's and Avvakum's use of figures of speech see V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, Ocherki poeticheskogo stilia drevnei Rusi (Moscow, 1947),

pp. 25, 36, 44, 47, 55, etc.; E. T. Cherkessov, "O vzaimodeistvii russkikh narodknykh i tserkovno-slavianskikh elementov rechi v russkom literaturnom iazyke dolomonosovskogo perioda," in Materialy i issledovaniia po istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (Moscow, Leningrad, 1951), II, 220-221; L. P. Iakubinskii, "O iazyke Slova o polku Igorove," in Doklady i soobshcheniia Instituta russkogo iazyka AN SSSR, II, 78: "Church Slavonic elements are made subordinate in the Slovo to the ancient Russian language, are absorbed by it, are placed in the service of Russia language." On the simultaneous use of Church Slavonic and the vernacular in the Supplication of Daniil see I. U. Budovnits: "Pamiatniki rannei dvorianskoi publitsistiki," TODRL, VIII, 139-140, 146 ff.

33. Kniaz' A. M. Kurbskii, Istoriia velikago kniazia moskovskago...(Moscow, 1833), I, 16-17, 36, 42-25, 89-94, 185, etc.

34. See Kurbsky's letter to Ivan IV and others: Kurbskii, II, 4-6, 104-105, 125, 128.

35. Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo (Moscow: Akademiia nauk, 1951). See Ivan's epistles to Kurbsky, pp. 29-41, 47-49, 209-210; Epistle to Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery, pp. 162-163, 175-189; Ivan's speeches contained in Stoglav, pp. 522-528. See Gudzy, History, p. 386; Komarovich, IRL, p. 302.

36. The sixty-fourth chapter of Domostroi was added by Archpriest Silvester in the mid-sixteenth century. See Domostroi, ed. V. Iakovlev (Odessa, 1887).

37. The anonymous author of Kazanskii letopisets was a Russian prisoner in Kazan before its conquest by Ivan IV. This work was published in Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, XIX(Petersburg, 1903). See also G. E. Kuntsevich: "Istoriia o Kazanskom tsarstve (Petersburg, 1905), and G. N. Moiseev: Avtor Kazanskoi istorii, TODRL, IX, 266-288.

38. The Domashniaia zapiska by Prince S. I. Shakhovskoi, who was disrespectfully nicknamed Kharia ("the Mug"), was published in Moskovskii vestnik (Moscow, 1830), Part V, pp. 61-70. Shakhovskoi's letters appeared in the same publication, pp. 70-73. See V. O. Kliuchevskii, Zhitia drevne-russkykh sviatykh kak istoricheskie istochniki (Moscow, 1881).

39. The work of Prince I. A. Khvorostinin-Starkovskii, Slovesa dnei, tsarei i sviatitelei moskovskikh, was published by Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, XIII (Petersburg, 1891), pp. 525-528. See also S. S. Platonov's note in Russkii arkhiv III (1880), 482, and Platonov's book, Drevnie russkie skazaniia i povesti o Smutnom vremeni... (Petersburg, 1888); and IRL, p. 57.

40. "Poslanie Dvorianina k Dvorianinu" by Ivanets Frunikov was first published by N. K. Nikol'skii in Bibliograficheskie zapiski, 1892, No. 4. A new, more accurate publication of the "Poslanie" can be found in I. I. Smirnov, Vosstanie Bolotnikova (Moscow, 1951), pp. 540-543. See S. K. Shambinago's critique of Frunikov's work in IRL, pp. 41-42.

41. Avvakum's Zhitie is also formally addressed to his spiritual director, Monk Epifany (Avvakum, pp. 1, 27, 31, 49, 51, 54, 56, 59). The public character of Tsar Ivan IV's letters was also evident to the Muscovite reader, and one of the manuscript copies of it even bears the title, "The Tsar's Message to the Russian State," Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo, p. 538.

42. See Ivan's expressions in his letter to Kurbsky in Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo: e. g., "Chto, sobaka!" (p. 16); "Pache kala smerdiai!" (p. 16); "Takikh sobak vezde kazniat" (p. 31); or "Pes Vasilii Sobakin" (p. 175); and compare Avvakum's "Talk on Abraham" in Materialy, V, where he says, "...i vybliadkov tekh ego uzhe mnogo, beshennykh sobak" (p. 363); or in "Tolkovanie na nekotorye psalmy i paremii," "bliad' pishetsia lozh'" (p. 34); "Tot iavnoi liubodei tserkovnyi krovopiets i navadnik, ubiitsa, dushegub," etc., and "podpazushnyi pes borzoi," etc. (p. 38); and in "Poslanie k nekomu Ioannu," "rodila na puti iduchi mladentsa vybliadka" (p. 283); "Kal esi, von' esi, pes esi smradnyi" (Pamiatniki, p. 352). In no other writings of the Muscovite period is it possible to find a similar style.

43. On the polemical tradition in Ivan's work see I. U. Budovits, Russkaia publitsistika 16-ogo veka (Moscow, 1947): Chapter on Ivan IV, pp. 280-296; D. S. Likhachev, "Ivan Groznyi pisatel'," in Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo, pp. 452-467; and IRL, p. 503.

44. Vinogradov remarks that such personal replies, harangues, and addresses to the reader form an intrinsic element of Avvakum's composition (see Nabliudeniia, pp. 207-217). This element of "talk with the reader," and manifestation of the spirit of the author, were traditional in early Russian literature. N. E. Trubetskoi, in "Khozhdenie za tri moria Afanasiia Nikitina kak literaturnyi pamiatnik," in Versty (Paris, 1926), pp. 166-67, demonstrates that Afanasy's skillful use of the personal address to the reader should be considered as a deliberate stylistic device. We have seen already that since the time of Vladimir Monomakh the simultaneous use of narrative and personal address has been well known in Russian literature.

45. See D. S. Likhachev's note on Ivan IV in Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo, p. 467; and Komarovich, IRL, p. 302.

46. The Metropolitan Filipp was murdered at the order of Tsar Ivan IV by the head of the Tsar's secret police, the dread oprichnina, in 1569, a crime which was particularly repugnant to popular opinion. Metropolitan Filipp was canonized in 1632, and on July 9, 1652, Metropolitan (later Patriarch) Nikon brought the sacred relics of St. Filipp to Moscow. Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich made public penance as the heir of Ivan IV for this crime upon that occasion (see G. P. Fedotov, Sviatoi Filip Metropolit Moskovskii (Paris, 1935), pp. 195-205.

47. Avvakum often mentions St. Filipp with the greatest reverence, and he even alludes to the strangling of the Metropolitan: "Oh Lord...if they strangle me, place me on the same list as St.

Filipp, Metropolitan of Moscow" (Avvakum, pp. 9, 10, 43; see also Pamiatniki, p. 867).

48. "Tolkovaniia na nekotorye psalmy i paremii," Materialy, V, 29. He mentions Ivan IV on many other occasions; for instance, in a letter to the Siberian flock (Pamiatniki, p. 867); in the same letter is the reference to the Stoglav.

49. See Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo, pp. 528-559.

50. Marguerite is a collection of works by St. John Chrysostom; it was popular in Muscovite Russia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Russian versions usually consisted of twenty of John Chrysostom's sermons. The first Russian printed edition appeared in Ostrog in 1595-1596; the first Moscow edition was printed in 1641.

51. See A. K. Borozdin, in Pamiatniki, pp. 136, 224-241, and 241 n.

52. Avvakum, pp. 7, 14, 17, 28, etc.; Adrianova-Peretts, Ocherki poeticheskogo stilia, pp. 46-47, etc.

53. "Tazhe sel opiat' na korabl' svoi, ezhe i pokazan mi, chto vyshe rekokh—poekhal na Lenu" (Avvakum, p. 14).

54. Avvakum, p. 28.

55. "Vidim iako zima khoshchet byti; serdtse oziablo i nogi zadrozhali" (Avvakum, p. 11).

56. This expression is used twice in Avvakum, p. 9.

57. See, for instance, "Nikon volk," Avvakum, p. 38; "volchonki," p. 46; "cherv'," p. 58; "sobaki," "vy razumnye svin'i," "gore tol'ko s vami tolstymi bykami," Materialy, V, 335.

58. Adrianova-Peretts, Ocherki poeticheskogo stilia, pp. 74-96. Cf. the metaphorical use of "fishes" in Avvakum, p. 58, and in the works of Kirill Turovskii, as mentioned by M. I. Sukhomlin, in "O sochineniakh Kirilla Turovskogo," in Rukopisi Grafa A. S. Uvarova (in series "Pamiatniki slovesnosti"), II (Petersburg, 1858), xxxiii-lxxii.

59. The entire stylistic development of Russian pre-Petrinian literature was conditioned by its dependence on early Christian and Byzantine literature, from which Russian writers borrowed the whole system of symbolical language and of epithets.

60. It was a simultaneous process of replacement of Church Slavonic and archaic Russian forms by the living vernacular.

61. Iakubinskii, Istoriia, pp. 309-310; Obnorskii, pp. 71-80. See L. P. Iakubinskii "O iazyke Slova...," II, 78. Compare P. Ia. Chernykh's statement in "Iazyk i pis'mo," Istoriia kultury drevnei Rusi (Moscow, 1951), p. 127, that "the process of assimilation of the Church Slavonic literary language with the living Ancient Russian tongue rapidly developed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries."

62. The most representative Balkan émigré in Russia in the late fourteenth century was Cyprian, Metropolitan of Moscow (d. 1406).

63. B. N. Unbegaun, La Langue littéraire russe au 16e siècle (Paris, 1935), pp. 20-29; on the use of the Russian vernacular in the chronicles of the sixteenth century, see p. 6.

64. One of the peculiarities of Timofeev's language is his method of placing verbs at the end of the sentence. He also makes considerable use of the original meanings of Christian names of Biblical origin. For instance, he calls Peter "Stone," Feodor "Gift of God." Another difficulty in deciphering his obscure language is presented by periphrases. He often uses a whole phrase instead of a single noun; instead of the word "gun," for example, he writes, "an artifice destroying cities"; in the place of "mill," "the stronghold of the milling artifice." See Ivan Timofeev, Vremennik (Moscow-Leningrad, 1951), pp. 405-406.

65. IRL, pp. 29-30, 41-52.

66. For Ivanets Frunikov's work, see footnote 40 above.

67. M. N. Speranskii, "Evoliutsiia Russkoi povesti v 17-om veke," in TODRL, I, 138, 149, connects the growth of the povest' genre with the differentiation of Russian society and formation of a middle urban class, which brought about the differentiation in the "literate milieu"; cf. V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, "Obraztsy obshchestvennoi parodii XVII-XIX vekov," in TODRL, III, 33, and V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, Ocherki po istorii satiricheskoi literatury 17-ogo veka (Moscow, 1937; abbreviated below as Ocherki) pp. 46-47, 172-173, etc.

68. IRL, p. 43.

69. One of the greatest masters of Russian language in the nineteenth century, I. S. Turgenev, esteemed highly the language and style of Avvakum, and considered that the Protopope's language sounds similar to the contemporary Muscovite dialect. He said: "That is the living Muscovite language, identical with the present Muscovite tongue. It often pains the ear (of a man of the educated society), but it is the pure Russian tongue." See A. L. Lukonina, "Moe znakomstvo s I. S. Turgenevym," in Severnyi vestnik, 1887, No. 2, pp. 55-56. Leo Tolstoy also said, "In Russian literature I would pay particular attention to the Protopope Avvakum; he is an excellent stylist" (see Literaturnoe nasledstvo, XXXVII-XXXVIII, [Moscow, 1939], p. 488).

70. "In the dissenters' democratic style of the seventeenth century Russian literary tongue, the vivid vernacular became a part of the ecclesiastical literary language and was, so to speak, consecrated by it.... The fight and the interrelations of both the ecclesiastical literary linguistic systems, Muscovite and Kievan, was accompanied by a sharp social differentiation of style in the literary languages" (V. V. Vinogradov, Ocherki po istorii russkogo

literaturnogo iazyka [Leiden, 1950], p. 36). While the Kievan, or rather West Russian, version of Church Slavonic became the official language of Muscovite literature in the late seventeenth century, the Muscovite version, considerably simplified by the late seventeenth century, remained the language of the Old Believers' literature.

71. Avvakum, "Kniga tolkovanii i nravouchenii," Pamiatniki, p. 475. See also I. Rumiantsev, Nikita Konstantinovich Druzhinin (Sergiev Posad, 1916), p. 307, and Vinogradov, Ocherki, pp. 33, 35-39. Avvakum and his contemporaries called colloquial Russian viakanie.

72. V. V. Vinogradov overlooked the difference between Avvakum's language and that of Epifany, on the one hand, and the language of the educated Old Believers like Deacon Feodor, Nikita Druzhinin, and Spiridon Potemkin, on the other. The language of Evfrosin was a further step in development of the language used by the Old Believers and became an intermediate phase between the language of the first generation of Old Believers and that of the eighteenth-century Old Believer writings, particularly of the Vyga school.

73. It is necessary to note, however, that the meaning of many words in the writings of Avvakum which sound indecorous or like invective to us had an entirely different significance at that time. The words bliad' and bliadstvo, for instance, had the meaning at that time of "heretical" and "heresy," rather than simply moral depravity as they do now.

74. A good example of use of the vernacular in historical narration can be found in Povest' ob Azovskom osadnom sidenii, particularly in its poetic version. See Voinskie povesti drevnei Rusi (Moscow, 1949), pp. 59-81, and the commentaries of A. N. Robinson on the language and style of the Povest' (pp. 216-226).

75. On the dialectical elements in the Zhitie see Chernykh, "Ocherki," p. 95. The first study of postpositional article in Avvakum's works belongs to V. S. Ivanov, in Russkii filologicheskii vestnik, 1898; it has been unavailable to me.

76. It was mainly the work of N. Karamzin and A. Pushkin.

77. The first theoretical attempt to attribute definite literary genres to the "high" style, the main feature of which was extensive use of the Church Slavonic, and the "low" style, composed primarily of the vernacular elements, was done by the author of the first Russian book on rhetoric, the so-called Filosofskaia kniga, who was very probably Makary, Bishop of Viatka, after 1619 Archbishop of Novgorod. See D. S. Babkin, "Russkaia retorika nachala 17-ogo veka," TODRL, VIII, 340-344, 347-349. However, only in the eighteenth century V. M. Lomonosov offered a well-thought-out theory of "high," "middle," and "low" styles; this theory was accepted by Russian writers of his century.

78. D. Sviatapolk Mirsky, p. 398.

79. The growing West and South Russian cultural influence in Moscow is especially well discussed in the monumental work of K. V. Kharlampovich, Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn' (Kazan, 1914), pp. 95-146.

80. N. Trubetskoy, in The Common Slavic Elements in Russian Culture (New York, 1949), pp. 23-33, writes: "Consequently, in its Church Slavonic elements, the Russian literary language belongs to the Ukrainian domain even more than to the Great Russian.... Until the time of Lomonosov all literate Russians studied Church Slavonic in the grammar of the Ukrainian scholar, Smotritskii." Also see Vinogradov, Ocherki, pp. 22-27, 63-64; and G. Vinokur, La Langue russe (Paris, 1947), p. 87.

81. Avvakum, p. 43; II Cor. 11:6.

82. Avvakum had such ascendancy over everyone around him that even his prison guards were won over to his cause. They would hide his letters in the handles of their halberds and transmit them to the Protopope's addressees. See Avvakum's letter to Morozova, in Avvakum, p. 113.

83. Letter to Ivan Veronov, Materialy, I, 1.

84. These works are "O zhestokostiakh voevody Pashkova," Pamiatniki, p. 710, three supplications to the Tsar Alexey Mikhaylovich (pp. 723, 751, 753); letters to the Igumen Feoktist (p. 907); to the Boyar A. Pleshcheev (p. 879); to the Servants of Christ (p. 822).

85. Only the Deacon Feodor and the monk Avraamy, fellow-believers of Avvakum, almost approach him in the volume of their literary production.

86. Only in the years 1652-1653 he spent about fifteen months, and in 1664 about six months in Muscovite educated society. The rest of his life he either lived in smaller towns or was in exile and prison.

87. Such, for instance, is the simple and informal style of Avvakum's last letter to Morozova, in Avvakum, p. 113, the style and language of his last treatise Evangelie vechnoe (1679), Pamiatniki, pp. 577-650, and his letters to his family and followers dating from the same time. In his last supplication to Tsar Feodor, in 1681, Avvakum's emotionalism is limitless and the words of tenderness addressed to the Tsar are interspersed with eruptive threats against the followers of Nikon. This letter reflects the nervous collapse of the Protopope. (Pamiatniki, pp. 767-771.)

88. Compare the letters of Morozova (Avvakum, pp. 106-110, 112-113), of Priest Anikin Ivanov (Avvakum, p. 111), the correspondence of the nobleman Leontiev (in Letopis', pp. 74-77), of P. Grekov (Letopis', p. 43), Monk Avraamy (Letopis', p. 70), and the letters of Archdeacon Feodor (Materialy, VI, 1-21, 90-138, and

Letopis', p. 67). Cf. Vinogradov, Ocherki, p. 41, and P. Chernykh, Iazyk Ulozhenia 1649-ogo goda (Moscow, 1953), pp. 80-111, 372. P. Chernykh is completely correct in stressing the stability of the Russian language since the seventeenth century and the striking similarities between the Russian literary language of today and the Muscovite colloquial and chancery language of the time of Avvakum.

89. A. I. Sobolevskii, in Obrazovannost' Moskovskoi Rossii XV-XVII v.v. (Petersburg, 1894), considers that even among the peasantry at the time of Avvakum the proportion of literates was about fifteen percent; among the lower urban classes, it was 16-42 percent; among the merchants, 75-96 percent.

90. With the exception of Morozova and her circle and of Princess Khovanskaya almost the whole aristocracy and nobility remained faithful to the established Church even after Nikon's reforms.

91. Protopopitsa is the Russian word for the wife of a protopope.

92. Avvakum, pp. 28-29.

93. Avvakum, p. 21.

94. Avvakum, p. 96.

95. Third letter to Morozova, Princess Urusova and Maria Danilova; Avvakum, p. 95.

96. F. Dostoevsky wrote on the difficulty of the translation of Avvakum's works in Dnevnik pisateliia za 1878 god: "I believe that if someone should translate such works as, for instance, the writings of Avvakum, it would be nonsense, or better to say, nothing would come out" (Sobranie sochinenii [Moscow, 1929], XI, 362).

97. Avvakum, p. 96.

98. The psychological description of the hero in Russian literature appeared for the first time in the historical writing of the early seventeenth century, particularly in the second version of Khronograf (1619) in the Vremennik by Ivan Timofeev, in the works of Prince I. Khvorostinin and of I. Katyrev-Rostovsky; see D. S. Likhachev, "Problema kharaktera," TODRL, VIII, 218-235, and O. A. Derzhavina, "Analiz obrazov povesti 17-ogo veka," in Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo gosudarstvenogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, VII (1946), 30. All the psychological portraits offer characteristics premeditated and distinctly defined by the authors themselves.

99. Avvakum, p. 26.

100. Avvakum, pp. 30, 39.

101. Avvakum, p. 34.

102. Avvakum, p. 33.

103. Avvakum, p. 34.

104. Fifth letter to Morozova, Avvakum, p. 102.

105. Avvakum, p. 6.

106. The end of the world was expected by the year 1666 because the number "666" was regarded as symbolic of the Antichrist. The decisions of the Council held in 1666-1667, which approved the reforms of books and rites initiated by Nikon, were therefore considered by the Old Believers as an announcement of the arrival of the Antichrist and the doom of the established church. See Ivanovskii, p. 161; "Vopros i otvet startsa Avraamiia," Materialy, VII, 239; Avvakum, in Materialy, V, 92, 216, 250, 262, 348, 361; Deacon Feodor, "O poznanii antikhristovoi prelesti," Materialy, VI, 79-89.

107. Avvakum's "Poslanie k Borisu s bratiei," Materialy, VIII, 90-91.

108. First letter to Morozova, Avvakum, p. 90.

109. See V. A. Miakotin, "Protopop Avvakum," in his Iz istorii russkago obshchestva: Etiudy i ocherki (1901), p. 18. The same difficulties, arising from their sermons, weremet by other preachers of the Zealots of Piety; for instance, Ivan Neronov and Priest Daniil.

110. Avvakum, pp. 8, 10.

111. Avvakum, pp. 83-84. Father Ivan Neronov, another leader of the early dissenters, also had visions of Christ and heard voices.

112. Avvakum, pp. 84-85. Kartashev, p. 381, speaks about the merging of matter and the spirit, the finite and the infinite in the Life written by Epifany. The same remark might be applied to the work of Avvakum.

113. Avvakum, p. 45. Monk Epifany in his Life also describes a fight with devils in a very realistic way. See Pamiatniki, pp. 229-62. Later on, F. Dostoevsky, in his Brothers Karamazov, describing Father Ferapont, also used a story similar to those of Avvakum and Epifany, that of a fight with a devil.

114. Avvakum, pp. 52, 55, 56.

115. Avvakum, p. 96.

116. Avvakum, p. 38. Avvakum addressed his words on the origin of the sign of the cross to the Eastern patriarchs, who had themselves always made it with three fingers. There is hardly any work of the Protopope's without similar sharp eruptions against the enemies of the Old Faith.

117. Avvakum, p. 39.

118. Supplication to Tsar Feodor, Avvakum, p. 87.

119. Avvakum, p. 26.

120. Avvakum, pp. 47-48.

121. Karion Istomin was an outstanding educator and writer of the late seventeenth century. He is the author of Bukvar', and numerous poetic works and translations. See F. N. Brailovskii, Odin iz pestrykh 17-ogo stoletia (Petersburg, 1902), in which some of Istomin's works are included. Silvester Medvedev (1641-1691), a pupil and follower of Simeon Polotsky, was a prominent Westernizer and writer. His main works, Izvestie istinnoe pravoslavnym and Sozertsanie kratkoe let 7190, 7192, were published in Chtenie Moskovskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnosti rossiiskikh, I (1885), IV (1894). Peter Kvashnin, a courtier at the end of the seventeenth century, was the author of harmonious lyrical poetry patterned in style after the popular folk song; his works are published in Izvestiia Akademii nauk, 1932, No. 10, Series 7, Otdelenie obshchestvennykh nauk, pp. 427, 431 ff. Of these three writers only K. Istomin had a lasting influence on Russian letters,and his Bukvar' became a popular textbook. Silvester Medvedev ended his life on the scaffold, accused of Latin heresy, and his works had no influence on the further literary development in Russia. Kvashnin's poetry is also entirely forgotten.

122. Kharlampovich, pp. 121-137.

123. V. N. Tatishchev's principal work, Istoriia Rossiiskaia, was published in 1768-1784 (Vols. I-IV) and in 1848 (Vol. V). His publicistic work Dukhovnaia appeared in print in 1773; his Razgovor dvukh priatelei o pol'ze nauki i uchilishch appeared only in 1887. I. Pososhkov's main work Kniga o skudnosti i bogatstve was first published in 1842, while his Zaveshchanie otecheskoe, a very interesting document on the Russian conservative mind in the eighteenth century, was published in part in 1873 and in full in 1893.

124. Feofan Prokopovich even initiated a Russian ecclesiastical inquisition, which was formally undertaken by decision of the Holy Synod on December 23, 1721; the so-called "Instruction of the Holy Synod to the Monk Pafnuty on the Occasion of his Appointment as Proto-Inquisitor." A widespread organization comprising an archinquisitor, provincial inquisitors, and city and district inquisitors was planned. See Polnoe sobranie zakonov rossiiskoi imperii, VI (St. Petersburg, 1830), No. 3870, pp. 467-476, particularly articles 3, 9, 10: p. 471; and "Schislenie raskol'nikov," in P. I. Mel'nikov, VII, 387.

125. The Holy Synod consisted in 1722 of five South Russians (Ukrainians) and four Great Russians. In 1725 it consisted of six South Russians and two Great Russians, the proportion remaining the same in 1746. In 1751 there were nine South Russians and one Great Russian, and in 1762, four and three, respectively. See Kharlampovich, pp. 471, 472, 485, 486.

126. Vinogradov, Ocherki, pp. 22-27, 28-29, 63-64, 75; V. V. Vinogradov, Velikii russkii iazyk (Moscow, 1945), pp. 72-75; Trubetskoy, pp. 23-33; Vinokur, p. 87.

127. A. S. Pushkin, "Vospominania o Karamzine" in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Moscow, 1949), VIII, 67.

128. The autobiography of Monk Epifany, spiritual mentor of Protopope Avvakum, was written at the Protopope's suggestion. Epifany, a simple monk, a far less educated and talented writer than Avvakum, wrote a short autobiography valuable for an understanding of the religious mind and spiritual world of an average seventeenth century Russian. It was published by Ia. L. Barskov in Pamiatniki, pp. 229-262. See IRL, pp. 322-326.

129. The work of an anonymous biographer of Boyarinya Morozova was published by N. Subotin in Materialy, VIII, 137-203.

130. Andrey Denisov (1664-1730) was one of the leaders of the Vyga Shore Dwellers' monastery and its spiritual director for almost a quarter of a century. His main work is Pomorskie otvety (Moscow, 1911), which contains the philosophy and theology of the priestless Old Believers and is a most interesting document of Russia's spirituality. His brother, Semen Denisov (1682-1741), is the author of Vinograd Rossiiskii and Istoriia ob otsekh i stradal'tsekh solovetskikh. Besides these main works the brothers wrote over two hundred others. Ivan Filippov (1665-1744), successor of the brothers Denisov and the spiritual leader of the Vyga monastery, wrote Istoriia Vygovskoi obshchiny (Petersburg, 1862), and other works.

131. D. L. Mordovstsev devoted to Avvakum his novel Velikii raskol (Moscow, 1881). He almost exactly reproduces the text of Avvakum in the account of Avvakum's exile to Siberia (see pp. 22-31 of the edition of 1914).

132. D. S. Merezhkovskii published his poem "Protopop Avvakum" in 1888; in it he describes the mode of thinking and the mysticism of the Protopope (see D. S. Merezhkovskii, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii [Moscow, 1914], XXII, 99-107). He also profusely used the style of the Protopope in the last part of his trilogy, Christ and Antichrist (Antikhrist: Petr i Aleksei); the entire topic of the trilogy was probably developed under the influence of the Old Believers' doctrine of the coming of the Antichrist to the world.

133. The early religious formation is described in Part I, Chapter IV of The Brothers Karamazov. See pp. 16 ff. of the Modern Library edition (New York, 1951).

134. Brothers Karamozov, p. 200.

135. Maximilian Voloshin wrote "Protopop Avvakum," published in Demony glukhonemye (Kharkov, 1919). L. M. Leonov said about Avvakum: "The language and the epic temperament of the autobiography of Avvakum have had great importance for me." See L. Batov, "Leonid Leonov," in La Littérature soviétique, 1946, p. 37.

KONI AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES: AUTHORS

By Michael Ginsburg
Professor of Slavic Studies at Indiana University

In the rich collection of memoirs covering the last half-century of pre-Revolutionary Russia the memoirs of Anatoly Fedorovich Koni[1] occupy a unique place. The "life path" of Koni was a long one; it began at a time when serfdom was still in existence, stretched through the era of the Great Reforms in the 1860's, through the years of political reaction under Alexander III and Nicholas II, through the period of far-reaching constitutional changes, and came to an end when the world with which Koni had been organically connected disappeared in the cataclysm of the Bolshevik Revolution. Koni's life was unusually crowded with varied activities which brought him in close contact with different people. A very prominent member of the judiciary who had advanced from modest positions in provincial courts to a seat in the Senate, the Supreme Court of Russia; a great authority in the field of criminal law; for many years a popular college professor; a member of the State Council; an honorary member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; a regular contributor to legal, historical, and literary journals and a prolific writer—this was Koni's cursus honorum.[2]

Koni was attracted by people and loved them. It would be an error to assume that he went through life without ever clashing with anybody. There were periods of difficult conflicts when he paid dearly for maintaining his principles and for refusing to compromise; he showed this trait of his character particularly in his capacity of judge at the times when his concept of duty did not coincide with the prevailing political trends.

Koni did not belong to any political party. He was a "son" of the era of the Great Reforms, and all his political and legal thinking was profoundly rooted in the traditions of that era; he always looked upon it as the best period of his life. If one should seek a political tag for Koni, the only suitable one would be that of "progressive conservative." He firmly believed that the reforms of the

1860's, which brought about deep changes in Russia's social system, would inevitably lead to a complete revision of her political system and culminate in the establishment of a parliamentary government. Together with many of his contemporaries who also belonged to the generation of the 1860's, he believed that such a development was not an idle dream but the logical and historically inevitable result of a peaceful evolution rooted in the innovations of Alexander II. He felt that if this process was interrupted, it was only because the reforms, first accepted as inevitable and beneficial, were later halted by frightened statesmen who considered them premature and dangerous.

Koni had friends and acquaintances in all strata of society. Among them were "fathers" and "sons" of the era of the Great Reforms, members of the academic world and the world of art, members of the Imperial family, prominent representatives of the higher bureaucracy from Milyutin and Loris-Melikov to Valuev and Witte. Associations with writers seem to have played a special part in his life. Among writers he had many close friends: among them were Leo Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Nekrasov, Goncharov, Chekhov, and Vladimir Soloviev. His relationship with each of them was very deep, and in many cases it left its imprint on the work of these writers: Koni with the wealth of his judicial experience and his vast knowledge of Russian life often was able to suggest stimulating ideas and give valuable advice.

While he was still a child, writers were frequent visitors in the Koni home. Some of them were contemporaries of Pushkin. The whole atmosphere in Koni's paternal home in St. Petersburg fostered his deep attachment to literature and art. During his student years at the University of Moscow he was received in the homes of Lazhechnikov, Pisemsky, Veltman, and Shchepkin, and from then on the circle of his friends among writers and artists constantly grew wider and wider.

Koni as a writer showed his mastery particularly in one genre—literary portraiture. Here he has no peer in Russian literature. No other Russian author has left us so rich a collection of sketches in which his contemporaries spring to life. Koni was particularly brilliant in miniature portraits, where the subject is presented with a few colorful strokes. His brush was soft, and he showed a great amount of objectivity in his treatment of the persons whom he depicted. But it is wrong to accuse him of having observed too closely the rule de mortuis aut bene aut nihil. He left portraits of many people whose political and social philosophy was completely foreign to him. Of them he wrote without any

gentleness, but he viewed them in their historical perspective and presented them in the light of conditions which had produced them.

A walk through Koni's portrait gallery is an unforgettable experience: there the great shades of an important era in Russia's past come back to life. In this Pantheon a special section is reserved for writers. Here are found Koni's memories of most of the authors he knew personally; here also is the portrait of one writer whom he had not known but for whom his admiration knew no bounds—Pushkin.[3] Some of these memories were presented in the form of essays; others were included in addresses before the Academy of Sciences or in public lectures.[4] All of his portraits of writers were written with great love and profound understanding. It was of writers like Koni that Prince Vladimir Odoevsky—one of the authors whose memory is also preserved there—said: "A writer writes well only if he dips his pen into ink to which he has added a few drops of his heart's blood."

I

In his memoirs Koni frequently pays tribute to persons who in their day had made great contributions to Russian life but whose names were forgotten by an ungrateful posterity. Koni considered it his moral duty to revive the memory of their life-work. One writer to whom he pays this tribute was Prince Vladimir Odoevsky.[5] It was on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his death in 1903 that Koni gave an address about this author, whose name was known only to the narrow circle of specialists in Russian literary history and Russian social thought. By some, Odoevsky was remembered as the author of beautiful stories for children[6] or as a prominent authority in the field of musicology, but to most Russian readers at this time his name meant practically nothing and it was quite common to confuse him with Prince Alexander Odoevsky, a participant in the Decembrist movement.

Koni always portrayed writers who were his contemporaries with a loving hand, but over his picture of Odoevsky he lingered with particular affection. Odoevsky's spiritual world was close to Koni, although Koni belonged to a younger generation. Many years before the Crimean War exposed the complete disintegration of the political system, Odoevsky was among the few who foresaw the disaster. He had warned his contemporaries of the danger in the widespread pride in Russia's illusory power and of their indifference to the spiritual needs of the nation.

Koni gives a succinct analysis of Odoevsky's Russian Nights, in which a small group of young intellectuals meet to philosophize on various problems of life; their discussions are interwoven with exquisite tales elaborating their dearest thoughts and hopes. Koni recalls some of the gems scattered in Odoevsky's writings. He is particularly fond of the short story about the brigadier who after sixty years of purposeless existence suddenly, when his end was already approaching, began to think and discovered the tragic emptiness of the life he had led.[7] Odoevsky had sincere respect for knowledge, but he despised people who sacrificed the broad humanitarian aspects of learning to a narrow specialization. With irony he described such a scholar in his Don Quixote of the Nineteenth Century in which a scientist had since the beginning of his career concentrated all his attention on mushrooms—he collected, classified, analyzed, grew, and studied them. Kingdoms fell, epidemics raged, poets and musicians sang, but he was aware only of mushrooms and went to his grave thinking only of them. Odoevsky also satirized scholars who were ready to draw important conclusions from casual experiments. He told of a physician who gave a slice of ham to a sick tailor who pleaded for it on his death bed. By some miracle the tailor recovered, and in his report the physician stated that the best cure for fever was a slice of ham. When this cure-all was administered to another patient who happened to be a cobbler, the poor man died; but the physician, unshaken in his faith in his discovery, amended his report to read that ham was an excellent medicine for tailors but should not be prescribed for cobblers.[8]

Though not a militant Slavophile, Odoevsky shared some of the opinions of this group. The epilogue of Russian Nights described the decadence of the Western World; it was the destiny of the Russians "placed on the boundary of two worlds" to rehabilitate Western Europe. But even as he was expressing these thoughts one of his heroes was Peter the Great,[9] the Slavophile's bête noire, and the impressions which Odoevsky gathered during his trips abroad (in 1859 he represented the Public Library of St. Petersburg at the memorial meeting for Schiller at Weimar) radically changed his attitude towards Western European culture.

Music, "the language for emotions that cannot be expressed by words," as Odoevsky said, occupied a very important place in his life. He was a perennial student of musical theory and the history of music and was a connoisseur of church music. Musicians were among his intimate friends, and Glinka often availed himself of his counsel while he was composing A Life for the Tsar (1836).

Some of the arias in the opera were actually suggested by Odoevsky, and the gay celebration of its success took place in his home. That evening a cantata written by Glinka and Odoevsky was performed by the guests.[10] Several years later when Glinka had to live through bitter moments of disappointment after the cold reception accorded Ruslan and Lyudmila, it was Odoevsky who raised his voice to insist on the great significance of the opera. Odoevsky's passion for music was also reflected in a number of charming stories written in the style of E. T. A. Hoffmann.[11]

Koni speaks with profound respect of Odoevsky's service to people. Odoevsky was a close friend of Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, who did much to further social welfare and who paved the way for the reforms of Alexander II,[12] and he displayed a great deal of devotion in establishing a number of institutions in St. Petersburg for the care of the poor and destitute. His favorite project was the Visiting Society, which during the rising tide of reaction in the last years of Nicholas I came under the suspicion of the Government and had to give up its independent existence. The reforms of Alexander II had a devoted follower in him.[13] Towards the end of his life when rumors about the imminent revision of some of the fundamental innovations became more and more persistent, Odoevsky wrote a personal letter to the Tsar beseeching him not to tolerate any change which would destroy the new pattern of life.[14]

II

Koni met Turgenev in 1874 on one of Turgenev's short visits to St. Petersburg.[15] The new court procedure which had been introduced ten years earlier by the reform of 1864 was attracting Turgenev's interest at that time. A case heard by the District Court at St. Petersburg in 1874 had aroused a great deal of attention because of the persons involved and the character of the crime—the murder of a wealthy landowner who had seduced a young girl and who afterwards arranged her marriage with a good friend of his, while concealing his former relations with the bride.[16] Koni was Public Prosecutor in this case, and Turgenev was eager to discuss with him some details of this sensational lawsuit. The visit which Turgenev paid him on this occasion in his chambers is vividly described by Koni. Turgenev wished to sit in on a session of the court with a jury, but all the cases that day were being tried behind closed doors. The presiding judge, a stickler for the rules, refused to admit Turgenev to

the courtroom unless he was a relative of the accused whose case was before the court or a member of the judiciary. Turgenev certainly did not satisfy the first requirement (the accused was a former soldier being tried for rape), but Koni thought he might fit into the other category; upon examining the lists of various judges he discovered that years before Turgenev had been elected honorary justice of the peace in his district but had never been notified of it. During the court recess Koni introduced the prominent visitor, already a famous writer for more than twenty-five years, to some of the judges. When Turgenev was presented to the dean of the group, a relic of the old judiciary, the latter condescendingly greeted him: "Turgenev, eh? Weren't you chairman of the court of the exchequer in [and he named some remote district town]?" Koni intervened explaining that the guest was the famous writer. Unmoved, the judge retorted: "A writer? Never heard of him!"[17]

In the years which followed, Koni often met Turgenev in the home of M. M. Stasyulevich, the publisher of the great liberal monthly Vestnik Evropy.[18] On these occasions Koni and other members of the group (whom Koni calls "the knights of the round table") often savored Turgenev's remarkable gift of improvisation. Koni describes a meeting at which Turgenev told of the impression made on him by the ancient sculptures discovered at Pergamon. Turgenev's account was so artistic and eloquent that when he finished, the host took him to his private office and locked him in, promising to release him only after he had put on paper the story he had just told.[19] Thus was born Turgenev's interesting and informative article "The Excavations at Pergamon"[20] which nevertheless, according to Koni, lacked the spark that had made the oral account so fascinating.

When Koni's father died in January 1879, the younger Koni found among his papers an old daguerrotype of Pauline Viardot, a present from this famous singer.[21] Koni sent this picture to Turgenev and received from him the following note: "I do not want to leave Russia without thanking you for your gift which is so dear to me. The daguerrotype of my old friend takes me back thirty years and revives for me that unforgettable time...."[22] Later, the same year, Koni was in Paris where he met Stasyulevich and his wife. Stasyulevich arranged a luncheon with Turgenev and it was agreed that Koni would fetch Turgenev. Koni called at Turgenev's home in the rue de Douet; he was shocked by the shabbiness of the rooms which Turgenev occupied, and by his neglected appearance. They were walking down the stairs when

they heard a contralto voice coming from behind one of the doors; Turgenev suddenly interrupted their conversation and, tiptoeing to the door, whispered, "What a voice! And even now!" Koni could never forget the expression in his face and the sound of his voice at that moment; they were full of boundless devotion and tenderness.

Koni also records the conversation which took place during the luncheon at Voisin. Turgenev was very gay and told stories about Zola and Daudet. Somehow the question of marriage came up, and Mme. Stasyulevich jokingly asked Turgenev to persuade Koni to submit to the bonds of matrimony. Turgenev remained silent for a while and then said to Koni with emothion: "Yes, yes, do get married! You cannot imagine how hard lonely old age can be—when one is forced to look for shelter on the rim of other people's nests, to accept attention as one would alms, and to be in the position of an old dog whom people don't chase away only out of habit and pity. Listen to my advice and don't condemn yourself to such a miserable future!" This was said with such ill-concealed pain that his listeners exchanged furtive glances. Turgenev noticed it and suddenly got up, ready to leave, obviously annoyed at himself for his outburst.[23] Years later Koni mentioned this episode to his old friend and teacher, B. N. Chicherin,[24] who knew Turgenev very well. This story recalled to Chicherin a remark made by Turgenev in the early 1860's. Turgenev and a group of his friends were discussing the necessity of getting out of false situations and in this way were agreeing with Alexandre Dumas' maxim: "On traverse une position équivoque, on ne reste pas dedans." "You think so?!" exclaimed Turgenev with sad irony. "One does not get out of a false situation, no! It is impossible to get out of it!"[25]

Koni saw Turgenev for the last time, in the summer of 1880 at the unveiling of Pushkin's monument in Moscow, an occasion on which Turgenev was given a spontaneous and cordial recognition by all the participants.[26] Three years later, after terrible suffering, Turgenev died at Bougival near Paris and his body was brought to St. Petersburg. In a paper presented to the Turgenev Society in St. Petersburg in 1922 Koni describes the funeral.[27] It was a manifestation of deep general grief, very similar to that shown two years earlier at the funeral of Dostoevsky. The bringing of Turgenev's body to the capital must have caused great worries to Count D. Tolstoy, the Minister of the Interior, and to V. Plehve, Director of Police; special instructions were given to the governors of the districts through which the funeral train had

to pass to "influence" the organizations and individuals who were anxious to pay tribute to the late writer. Stasyulevich, who met the body at the frontier and accompanied it to St. Petersburg, recalled with disgust the obstacles put in their way and the haste with which the train was rushed through. It was as if the coffin contained a notorious criminal instead of a great writer. In the capital, police agents in large numbers were assigned to the procession; uniformed police detachments were placed at the cemetery and more police were held in reserve. Gresser, the Governor of the city, personally supervised the funeral. All these precautions could not lessen the display of public mourning.[28] The procession included 176 delegations representing literature, the press, scientific, educational, and artistic societies, colleges and schools, municipal organizations, and various national groups.

As Koni rightly remarks, the "moral funeral" of Turgenev continued for years after his death. The number of detractors who blackened his name was great, and Koni was among those loyal friends who took upon themselves the task of defending his memory. Koni lashes out against some of the writers who were among these detractors.[29]

For Koni, as for so many others who belonged to the generation of the 1860's, Turgenev was above all else the man in the forefront of those who brought about the liberation of the Russian peasants in 1861.[30] In Koni's opinion Turgenev's greatest claim to immortality was in the literary and political work which contributed so greatly to the ending of serfdom in Russia. When Turgenev's body was beginning its homeward journey at the Gare du Nord in Paris, Edmond About, bidding him farewell in the name of French writers, said: "As a monument to you a simple piece of chain thrown over your grave will suffice. Such a mausoleum will satisfy your honest ambition, and this symbol will loudly proclaim all that you have done for your country."

Koni must have felt that no better tribute could be paid to the memory of Turgenev.[31]

III

As a criminologist, Koni had a greater interest in Dostoevsky than in any other contemporary writer.[32] It is not difficult to imagine how deeply moved was young Koni when in January 1866 he was given the opportunity to read the first part of Crime and Punishment;[33] there he certainly must have found answers to many questions which were confronting him in his own work. The reception given to the novel upon its publication was far from enthusi-

astic; there were voices which called it a slander and a calumny of the younger generation. Actual events, however, soon proved its events true to life.[34] Koni participated in the heated discussions stirred up by Dostoevsky; he was so aroused by the stubborn unwillingness of some critics to see in the novel anything more than a sordid story that a clash with an opponent in a bitter argument almost ended in a duel.

At this time Koni did not make Dostoevsky's acquaintance; they met only years later when Koni was a member of the judiciary in St. Petersburg. In 1873 Dostoevsky had some troubles with the censors. As editor of Grazhdanin, a weekly which appeared in St. Petersburg, he published an article in which the reception of a Kirghiz delegation by Alexander II was described.[35] The article quoted the words addressed to one of the delegates by the Tsar. This was done without the required approval of the Minister of the Imperial Household, and the Censorship Committee instructed the Public Prosecutor to start proceedings against Dostoevsky. The sentence was an arrest of two days and a fine. In this connection Dostoevsky approached Koni who at that time occupied a prominent position in the District Court, and asked him to arrange the postponement of the arrest. This Koni was able to do.[36] Thus began a personal relationship which lasted until Dostoevsky's death in 1881.

Koni records several occasions on which Dostoevsky came to him for advice and assistance on behalf of people threatened by the law. One of these occasions occurred in 1876 in connection with the trial of a young woman, Catherine Kornilova, who was pregnant. Abused and taunted by her husband who constantly complained of her housekeeping as poor and unfavorably compared her with his first wife, Kornilova pushed his six-year-old daughter by the former marriage out of the window of their fourth-story apartment; by some miracle the child was unhurt. The court found Kornilova guilty.[37] This case naturally aroused the interest and sympathy of Dostoevsky. In the October 1876 issue of his Author's Diary he made a penetrating study of this case.[38] Depicting movingly the scene of the condemned woman with a newborn child in her arms taking leave of her husband, he raised the question whether the sentence might not have been more humane. At the same time that Dostoevsky was using all his energies to obtain a revision of the verdict and repeatedly called on Koni to solicit his help, Koni was preparing an appeal for clemency, but this proved unnecessary. The Supreme Court of Appeal rescinded the verdict, and when the case was re-tried with competent medical testimony,

Kornilova was acquitted. Dostoevsky greeted this happy ending with profound joy and the just pride of one who has raised his lonely voice in protest against inhumanity.[39]

The most memorable occasion on which Koni had the opportunity to observe Dostoevsky before the public was at the unveiling of the Pushkin monument in Moscow in June 1880. This ceremony was one of the most outstanding events in Russian public life of the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[40] Koni represented the St. Petersburg Legal Society on this occasion. During the first phase of the celebration Turgenev was the hero; when the University of Moscow bestowed on him an honorary degree, the large and enthusiastic audience acclaimed in him a worthy successor of Pushkin. On all the succeeding occasions during the celebration he remained the center of public attention, but the last day was a triumph for Dostoevsky, when he delivered his famous Pushkin address—perhaps the most important of his nonfictional writings. Some of Dostoevsky's ideas in this address were controversial and evoked justifiable criticism on closer examination, but the effect of his words on the emotionally aroused audience was electrifying. Even the visitors from abroad who were present shared the general enthusiasm; Professor Louis Leger of the Sorbonne told Koni how much he wished to take back to the old maître—Victor Hugo—the impression of this unique experience.

Koni's account of the sudden death of Dostoevsky, six months after the Pushkin celebration, shows the enormous popularity of the writer among all classes of Russian society. On that day Koni, presiding judge of the St. Petersburg District Court, summoned one of his secretaries for a routine conference. The young man began to read the day's report when his voice broke and he could not go on. Koni, still unaware of the sorrowful news, asked him whether he was ill. "Dostoevsky...Dostoevsky is dead!" sobbed the secretary, and burst into tears.[41] The funeral of Dostoevsky surpassed any manifestation of public mourning the capital had ever witnessed; the procession of mourners stretched for miles, and perfect order was maintained by students of the University and other colleges. "People from everywhere, forgetting their disagreements and all the problems of the day, gathered around his coffin to revere in him not only the great creator of The Insulted and the Injured but their friend and defender," Koni said in concluding his account of Dostoevsky's funeral.[42]

The best analysis of Dostoevsky's ideas about the problems of crime is undoubtedly Koni's.[43] Koni's life work was the elaboration of what he called "criminal policy," which he defined as a

legal science dealing with the sociological roots of crime.[44] In Dostoevsky he found a kindred spirit.[45] At the memorial meeting for Dostoevsky held by the Legal Society of the University of St. Petersburg in February 1881, Koni gave an address on Dostoevsky's contribution to "criminal policy."[46] As Koni pointed out, for Dostoevsky a criminal act was not a mere infringement of the law but a much deeper phenomenon which reflected intricate human relationships. The theory of criminal law formulates the content of a crime in general terms, but the irreconcilable conflicts which are behind a crime, the inner struggle which goes on in a potential criminal between his will and his passion, his conscience and his impulses, before he takes the decisive step—none of this finds expression in legal theory. Dostoevsky saw the abyss which lies in the field of criminology between abstract theory and reality. His constant concern was to find answers to the concrete problems arising before the courts of justice. Koni felt that in Crime and Punishment there is a complete picture of the inner evolution of a crime from the moment when the idea of the deed is conceived until the actual shedding of blood—the tragic climax of that idea.[47] For Dostoevsky a crime is not an outgrowth of a sudden thought born unexpectedly and developed by some mental processes; like a seed dropped into fertile soil, it grows in a specific environment which nourishes it and fosters its sprouting.

Dostoevsky was vitally interested in the methods used for identifying and evaluationg individual facts which are the composite elements of a crime.[48] The main task of the criminal investigation is to establish an indestructable connection between these facts; each of them taken separately might have no significance, but linked together they constitute irrefutable evidence against the person suspected of the crime. This process is analyzed in the work of Porfiry Petrovich, the canny, subtle, but warmhearted investigator in Crime and Punishment. In his sparring with Raskolnikov he patiently gathers evidence which he carefully checks against his own suspicions until this evidence adds up to indisputable proof of Raskolnikov's guilt.

Dostoevsky realized how important it was for the courts to have an understanding of the various abnormalities under the impact of which the criminal commits his act.[49] He distinguished three types of deviations from the normal which influence criminal behavior. The first is represented by persons of weakened will-power: the many chronic drunkards in Dostoevsky's novels belong to this group. Persons whose mental powers are impaired and who might be considered insane in varying degrees belong to

the second category. In Koni's opinion it is difficult to find in the most penetrating scientific studies an analysis of these mental aberrations comparable to the picture of the most complicated cases scattered throughout the writings of Dostoevsky. The third type of mentally abnormal persons, for the understanding of whom Dostoevsky made an exceptionally important contribution, includes persons whom Koni described as suffering because of an acute spiritual hunger—those who are unable to find an answer to the constant anxieties and doubts which torment them. Dostoevsky pictured these sufferers with particular sympathy. In the forefront of these persons stand the members of the various religious sects portrayed by Dostoevsky in his House of Death. In handling these cases the courts and the law enforcement officials often showed a complete lack of understanding. The doctrine and the rites of some sects with their peculiarly pessimistic approach to life were often rooted in an ecstatic exaltation in suffering. The Russian Criminal Code took no account of this neurotic attitude and was merciless in punishing the practitioners. Frequently the victims of this short-sighted attitude of the law accepted punishment with joy, since it satisfied the need they felt to seek salvation through suffering.

Koni thought that perhaps the greatest contribution made by Dostoevsky to criminology was his analysis of different aspects of punishment.[50] Dostoevsky was the first to give the public a realistic picture of forced labor in Siberia. His conclusions about the nature of punishment and its effect on the persons punished were wise and far-reaching. He examined from the psychological standpoint the conditions in prisons and penal settlements where people were inseparably thrown together. When Dostoevsky himself entered "the house of death" it was not so much the inescapable necessity to live among people of different habits and backgrounds that frightened him—he felt he had sufficient resources to adapt himself to the new environment—but it was the realization of one tragic fact, that he would never be alone. Again and again he tried to prove that no human being should be deprived of an opportunity to enjoy occasional solitude. On the other hand, Dostoevsky protested bitterly against the other extreme—solitary confinement. "No human being should be transformed into a living corpse!" exclaimed Dostoevsky, who repeatedly raised his voice against the unnecessary humiliation of the inmates of prisons.[51]

In Koni's opinion, The House of Death is the greatest book ever written about prison. He compares it with the well-known Le Mie Prigioni by Sylvio Pellico and comes to the conclusion that in

Dostoevsky's book the public was given a much more penetrating insight into prison tragedies than in Pellico's.[52] Pellico was primarily concerned with his own sufferings and emotions and wrote almost exclusively about them; Dostoevsky focussed his attention on the people around him and spoke little of his own misery. As a result of this approach to prison life, the reader of The House of Death sees before him not a vague mass of human creatures victimized by a cruel penal system but a living organism, multi-colored, and diversified in its composition.

Dostoevsky's protest against capital punishment was unequivocal. Hardly any other writer has condemned this form of punishment in more passionate words than did Dostoevsky in The Idiot. For him it represented something infinitely more cruel than the crime itself. Dostoevsky carried further Victor Hugo's account of the last day of a man sentenced to death, an account which comes to an end when the scaffold appears; Dostoevsky mounted the block with the victim and described that "quarter-second when the blade whirs above his head." This description in its fervor and dramatic brevity stands alone in literature.

Dostoevsky, the passionate defender of the weak, gave his heart to children.[53] Again and again he pleaded for loving treatment of the child faced with cruel reality. Koni likened this quality in Dostoevsky to Dickens' attitude towards children.[54] Many pages of the Author's Diary were dedicated to them. One of the most difficult problems confronting penology is that of applying punishment to children; to this question Dostoevsky devoted a great deal of thought and compassion.

Looking back to the memorable years of the 1860's when the Russian courts shed their old form and went through a period of profound changes, one must agree with Koni that the figure of Dostoevsky stood as a beacon throwing heart-warming light on human beings so long ignored and neglected by the pre-Reform law.[55]

IV

Nekrasov's[56] name was familiar to Koni from the days of his youth on.[57] His extremely friendly and warm attitude towards this writer, which found expression whenever Koni wrote or spoke of him, reflected not only his own feelings but also those of his father. The elder Koni came to the rescue of young Nekrasov when the latter was starting his literary career under most difficult circumstances and was on the verge of starvation.[58] Koni gave him work in the Literaturnaia gazeta, of which he was publisher and

editor. For whole weeks Nekrasov found refuge in Koni's hospitable home. In a letter to Koni's father, Nekrasov acknowledged his deep indebtedness to him as the person who helped him "to climb out of the filth" of his environment.[59]

After 1872, Koni met Nekrasov frequently in the home of their mutual friend, A. N. Erakov, where many prominent writers gathered. By that time the social and financial position of Nekrasov had greatly improved. One of the meetings between Koni and Nekrasov left a memorable trace on Nekrasov's poetic work. In the summer of 1873 they were returning to St. Petersburg from the country when in the course of their conversation Koni asked Nekrasov why he had left unfinished his great poem Who Can Be Happy and Free in Russia?[60] Nekrasov explained that in writing it he had reached the point where he felt he should include some vivid pictures of life under serfdom; for this he needed factual material which he had no time to gather. Besides, he remarked, it was difficult to find such material because no one in Russia seemed to be interested even in the recent past. "You must constantly shake people up—otherwise they might forget even their own names."[61] Koni suggested that this was exactly what Nekrasov should do—urge his friends to furnish him the necessary information. He added that he himself could tell him about a case he had heard about in his youth.[62] While Koni was a student at the University of Moscow, he spent the summer of 1863 at a country estate in the Ryazan district, tutoring the landlord's children. Keenly interested in the profound changes which were taking place in the life of the Russian village after the abolishment of serfdom two years earlier, Koni would engage the peasants in long conversations, trying to detect the rapidly vanishing traces of the old mode of living. On one such occasion an old peasant told Koni about a strange incident which Koni now brought to Nekrasov's attention. This was the story of a local landlord who was notorious for his cruelty towards the peasants. The landlord's favorite coachman, an unscrupulous and merciless fellow, was the zealous executor of all his master's sadistic whims. As a result of constant dissipation the landlord lost the use of his legs and the burly coachman had to carry him about in his arms. This coachman, a village version of Ivan the Terrible's henchman, Malyuta Skuratov, had a son upon whom the father poured all his love. The young peasant decided to marry, and since this could be done only with the landlord's consent, he and the girl he loved came to the landlord to ask his blessing. Unfortunately the young girl attracted the landlord's attention; he refused to approve the marriage. The

young man was heartbroken and when sometime later he met the landlord, he fell on his knees and again beseeched him to give his consent. The landlord remained adamant, and the enraged youth heaped curses on him. The irate landlord had him conscripted into the army and the entreaties of the father were of no avail. After that the father began to drink heavily, but two weeks later he reformed, was "pardoned" by the landlord, and resumed his functions of coachman and bodyguard. Soon afterwards the landlord decided to visit a neighbor. Near the estate was a deep, wooded ravine with an abandoned road running through it. While driving his master to the neighbor's, the coachman suddenly changed direction and, in spite of the angry protests of the landlord, drove into the ravine. There he stopped, silently unharnessed the horses, and grasped the reins. The landlord, sensing danger, began to beg for his life; the coachman replied: "Don't worry, Master, I won't kill you. I won't take this sin on my soul. But you have become such poison to me, and life with you is so unbearable, that I, an old man, must destroy my soul because of you." Thereupon he climbed up a tree and hanged himself.

Before Koni and Nekrasov parted that evening, Nekrasov remarked that he would use that story. A year later Koni received the printer's proof of a poem entitled Of the Exemplary Serf, Yakov the Faithful, in which the episode in the Ryazan village was retold in powerful and moving verse.[63] This became part of the poem Who Can Be Happy and Free in Russia?

Nekrasov had many enemies, and many evil rumors were constantly spread about him. Most of these rumors, some of which were very persistent, had to do with the fact that he won large sums at cards. Koni records a conversation which he had with Nekrasov with regard to his passion for gambling.[64] In 1874 the capital was stirred by the prosecution initiated by Koni against Kolemin, an army officer, who ran a fashionable gambling house. The court found Kolemin guilty, and Koni suggested that his bank accounts be impounded.[65] Some one must have persuaded Nekrasov that Koni planned to prosecute all who had won large sums in gambling clubs and to impound their winnings. Nekrasov was worried that this might happen to him and he might thus be deprived of the possibility of continuing to publish his review Otechestvennyia zapiski. Nekrasov went to Koni to check on this rumor, and Koni allayed his fears, explaining to him its absurdity; on that occasion Nekrasov bared his soul to Koni, who had then a good glimpse of a man in the grip of a pathological passion for gambling.[66]

After Nekrasov's death in December 1887, Koni never missed an opportunity to defend Nekrasov's memory from all the petty and malicious accusations which were heaped upon his name.[67] Just as Koni's father had helped Nekrasov at an early stage of his literary career "to climb out of the filth," Koni himself did all in his power to keep the "filth" which personal and political enemies were casting on his memory from obscuring his place in Russian letters. The debt which Russian society owed Nekrasov[68] was, in Koni's judgment, so great that in the light of it, his human shortcomings and weaknesses were completely eclipsed.[69]

V

Koni's reminiscences of his meetings with Leo Tolstoy represent, by his own admission, only random impressions; nevertheless the information which they contain is of great importance.[70]

Koni met Tolstoy for the first time in the summer of 1887 when he visited Yasnaya Polyana upon the invitation of Tolstoy's brother-in-law, Kuzminsky, a colleague of Koni in the judiciary.[71] Koni was very apprehensive of this meeting, remembering that often personal contacts with great men prove to be disappointing. Very soon his fears were swept away: a friendship between the two men was born on the first day of Koni's stay in Yasnaya Polyana—a friendship which was to last for over two decades. Koni left a description of the family life at Yasnaya Polyana and of the visitors who flocked to this famous place. At the end of a long evening, Tolstoy himself led Koni to his work room; there, beside the table at which Tolstoy had written War and Peace and Anna Karenina, a bed had been prepared for Koni. Tolstoy busied himself with books while Koni was getting ready for the night, and then sat down on the edge of the bed; between the two began, to quote Koni, "one of those typical Russian conversations usually carried on in the vestibule before a friend's departure or on the edge of a friend's bed."

That night and on the following days innumerable questions were discussed by the two. It was a period in Tolstoy's life when he was preoccupied with thoughts of non-resistance to evil, and he was interested in Koni's reaction to these ideas. Koni disagreed with Tolstoy's point of view; as a judge whose duty it was, among other things, to mete out punishment for unlawful attacks of all kinds, he could not accept unreservedly the principle defended by Tolstoy. On a number of occasions during this visit Koni observed the relationship between Tolstoy and the peasants—a relationship

based on genuine mutual respect and understanding. Many of the thoughts Tolstoy expressed were written down by Koni while he was under the fresh impression of their conversations. Though some of those thoughts occur in Tolstoy's later writings, Koni's notes are valuable because they preserve the form in which they were first voiced in an informal, heart-to-heart exchange of opinions. They talked about literary problems, social conditions, religion and morality; a theme to which Tolstoy returned frequently was that of death and life after death.[72] This first meeting between Tolstoy and Koni had a memorable aftermath. It was during this stay of Koni at Yasnaya Polyana that the seed which eventually produced Tolstoy's Resurrection was planted in the writer's mind, as will be shown below.

Thus a very close and warm relationship between Tolstoy and Koni was born in the summer of 1887. Tolstoy's hostile attitude towards the courts of law and their representatives is well known, but from the first he must have sensed Koni's deep humanitarianism. In the ensuing years Koni on his visits to Moscow never missed the opportunity to call on Tolstoy. His memoirs contain a colorful description of life in Tolstoy's house in Khamovniki.[73]

In 1897 Tolstoy paid a visit to Koni in St. Petersburg. This is how Koni described that visit: When Koni returned home from a late meeting and was about to settle down to more work, his old housekeeper announced the arrival of a muzhik who wished to see Koni. The name of the muzhik turned out to be "Lev Nikolaevich"; the old woman, annoyed by this late call, was surprised at the cordial reception which Koni gave to the intruder. That night a gay party was in progress in the adjoining apartment, and sounds of dancing and music could be heard. Suddenly the noise stopped. When Tolstoy was about to leave and Koni accompanied him to the door, they discovered that the hall was crowded with people from the next-door party. As it turned out, the old housekeeper, puzzled by the visitor's striking resemblance to a picture of Tolstoy recently received by Koni, had confided her suspicions as to his identity to the neighbors and their guests. The embarrassed Tolstoy hurried away from the curious crowd.[74]

After a short meeting in Moscow the following year came a long intermission in the personal contact between Tolstoy and Koni. Six years later, during Easter 1904, Koni revisited Yasnaya Polyana. Tolstoy had aged and had a haggard look, but Koni found him mellowed in spirit and softer in his appraisal of others, though even less tolerant of his own shortcomings. The Russo-Japanese War was in full progress, and Tolstoy's reaction to what

he considered senseless slaughter was that of profound grief. While Koni was staying with Tolstoy, the news of the death of Countess Alexandra Andreevna Tolstaya reached Yasnaya Polyana; Koni had known this colorful woman who, though of the same age as Tolstoy, was his aunt, and Koni has drawn a striking sketch of her.[75] She was very close to the Imperial family as tutor of the Grand Duchess Marie, who later married the Duke of Edinburgh; during her long life she had met many prominent people. Koni records her account of her conversation with Bismarck in Baden-Baden. For many years a warm friendship had existed between her and her famous nephew, a friendship Koni describes as an amitié amoureuse, which unfortunately turned into a conflict between Alexandra Andreevna, all her life a staunch and intolerant Orthodox, and Tolstoy, when he began to drift away from the Orthodox Church. In her memoirs describing her relations with Tolstoy she bitterly assailed him for having questioned the sacrosanct authority of the Church and having become, in her words, "worse than any sectarian." Early in 1903 she offered these memoirs to the Academy of Sciences on condition that they be published and the profits used for charity. The Academy asked Koni to edit the publication. Shortly before that the newspapers had carried the announcement of Tolstoy's excommunication by the Holy Synod, as a result of which Tolstoy was bombarded by letters full of threats and curses. Koni felt that the moment was highly inappropriate for the publication of memoirs which would only add fuel to the flame; the other members of the Academy shared his opinion, and Countess Tolstaya agreed to postpone publication.[76]

Koni had in his archives thirty-six letters of Tolstoy's addressed to him.[77] Most of these letters dealt with occurrences in which both men were interested; although very succinct, the letters contain a great deal of information. Their predominant theme was Tolstoy's constant and passionate intervention in behalf of victims of the reactionary policies of the Government. The majority of these were people who were persecuted as a result of the peculiar so-called "religious tolerance" which was enforced by the Government before the promulgation of the Manifesto of April 17, 1905, and this "tolerance" was a complete denial of real freedom of belief. The law and the decisions handed down by the courts protected the interests of the Orthodox Church by persecuting non-conformists and by chaining them to a Church with which they had nothing in common. These people did not belong to sects whose teachings were incompatible with accepted standards of morality; as a rule, they were deeply religious and adhered to very high

moral standards. Their sufferings, the cruel punishments meted out by the Government and the courts against their families, the ruthless separation of children from their parents aroused Tolstoy's indignant protests. In his efforts to come to their rescue he often appealed to Koni for help and advice.[78] In 1904, when Koni was ill, Tolstoy wrote him: "I am sorry about your illness. With God's help, may you bear it as well as possible, and not interrupt your work for humanity—the best medicine against any illness."[79]

During their first encounter in 1887 Tolstoy and Koni discussed various aspects of religion and morality. In the course of their conversations Koni frequently told Tolstoy about cases which had come to his attention as judge and Public Prosecutor. Koni firmly believed that any violation of the moral code entails severe moral punishment in the form of a guilty conscience—a conviction that had been confirmed by many experiences. As an illustration of this thesis, Koni used a case which, as he modestly understates it, was "destined to leave some trace" in the work of Tolstoy.[80]

In the early 1870's Koni was Public Prosecutor in the District Court at St. Petersburg. One day a young man, obviously belonging to a good family, called on him in his chambers. The visitor's behavior betrayed great nervousness; the purpose of his call was to lodge a complaint against the prison authorities who had refused to deliver a letter to a girl inmate without its being censored. Koni explained to him that this was in accordance with prison regulations. Thereupon the visitor suggested that Koni himself read the letter and give orders for its delivery to Rosalie Onni.[81] She was a prostitute who had been sentenced to four months in prison for having stolen a hundred rubles from a drunken "client" in a brothel of the lowest kind. Koni declined to read it and asked the visitor to tell him its contents. "I am asking that she marry me and that the ceremony be performed as soon as possible," was his reply. Koni pointed out that the marriage would have to be postponed until after the girl's release, since special permission for marriage in prison could be granted only in exceptional cases. In the course of their conversation Koni found out that the young man had graduated from an exclusive law college and was working in one of the ministries. He insisted on his decision to marry the girl without delay. Koni engaged him in a frank converstion; he asked the young man whether he knew anything of the girl's past, what her position would be in his family, what kind of life they would have together. The visitor agreed with the objections Koni raised, but he stubbornly repeated that his decision was unshakeable. Koni suggested that it might be better to

wait until her release from prison; then he would be able to create a better environment for her and help in her rehabilitation. Koni emphasized his conviction that to help a prostitute to return to a normal life was a fine deed, but he expressed doubt whether marriage was the way to do it. "In these rooms," Koni added, "I have listened to many confessions by people who committed crimes or were on the verge of committing them—crimes growing out of sacrifices which proved to be utterly useless for one party and completely incomprehensible to the other." The visitor listened and left without saying anything further.

The next day Koni received a letter from him admitting that many things which Koni had said were true but that in spite of it his resolve to marry remained unchanged; he asked Koni to do what he could to remove the obstacles to an immediate wedding. Before Koni had time to write him, the girl's reply to the proposal was brought to his attention: in an illiterate scrawl she accepted it. Soon afterwards the young suitor wrote Koni an angry letter reproaching him for having interfered with his personal affairs. Koni felt that the young man was bringing disaster on himself, and he refused to give his consent to the marriage in prison—in spite of the pressure which was brought to bear by some society ladies to whom the young nobleman obviously had appealed for help. In the meantime the Lenten season, during which marriages were not performed, had begun. The suitor made frequent calls at the prison and showered the girl with expensive presents. The Lenten season was drawing to an end when the girl suddenly contracted typhoid fever and died. The young man suffered a great shock upon learning this unexpected news. Soon he vanished from Koni's horizon, and it was years before Koni was reminded of this story when he came across a note in the newspapers that a person of his name had been appointed Vice Governor of one of the districts.

Some three months after the girl's death the old prison matron told Koni about her conversations with the girl, who had become attached to her. The girl had explained why the young man wished to marry her. She was the daughter of a widower who rented from a wealthy society lady in St. Petersburg a small farm in Finland. When the widower became hopelessly ill, he begged the lady in St. Petersburg to take care of the child after his death. The lady took the little orphan to her home and pampered her for a while; later, the girl was treated as a housemaid. When she was sixteen, she attracted the attention of a young relative of her mistress; while visiting with the family in the country, he seduced her. As soon as the consequences became apparent, the indignant

lady dismissed her. Abandoned and penniless, she put her child in an orphanage and began an existence which eventually brought her to a brothel. In the meantime, her lover, unaware of the tragedy, was pursuing his career. While serving on a jury in the District Court, he suddenly recognized in the prostitute before the bar the girl he had known years before. His conscience tortured him, and atonement for his sin became an obsession.

For Koni this story was not just another melodramatic episode but rather a profound manifestation of a supreme justice.

Tolstoy listened to the story with rapt attention; the next day he remarked that during the night he had been thinking of it constantly. The story had made such a vivid impression that he at once thought of it as a theme for a literary work; in his mind there had already begun to crystallize a plan according to which the various phases of the story would be presented in a chronological order. At this time Tolstoy was interested in popular literature for mass reading, and he asked Koni to write a story about Rosalie Onni for the publishing house Posrednik, which was issuing these books. Koni hesitated to undertake this task; in his opinion, as he told his host, only a Dostoevsky or a Tolstoy could do it properly, and since Dostoevsky was no longer alive, it fell to Tolstoy to use the story. Soon after Koni's return to St. Petersburg from Yasnaya Polyana, Tolstoy asked his close friend, P. I. Biryukov,[82] to call on Koni and to remind him about the story Tolstoy expected him to write. In his letters to Koni during that period Tolstoy repeatedly returned to this subject and urged Koni to write on it, in spite of the fact that Koni continued to insist that Tolstoy himself use the topic for a work of deep moral significance.

The following years when still no manuscript had arrived from Koni, Tolstoy began to think of writing the story himself; he asked Biryukov to find out whether Koni would still be willing to let him use the materials. Apparently, the writer in him yearned to do it, but he was living through a period when he considered working in the fields much more important than writing, and therefore he imposed a strict discipline upon himself. He confessed to Biryukov: "With my head I wish to write, and I think that I should do it, but I cannot; my heart is not in it." In 1889 he broke this resolve and resumed his literary work, but there is nothing to indicate that Koni's story occupied his thoughts. Late that year his diary contains the following: "Thoughts concerning Koni's story become clearer and clearer in my head. This is the second day that I feel elated. What might come of this I do not

know."[83] Two weeks later Tolstoy wrote in his diary: "Data for Koni's story are vaguely piling up. Often I feel the desire to write and I think of it with joy." Finally, under the date of December 26, the diary records that Tolstoy has "suddenly begun to write Koni's story and it looks as if it is not bad!"

After starting work on Koni's story, Tolstoy continued to write it until February 1890; by that time he seems to have lost interest in it. In June of the same year he noted that he was still working on it, but added that the work did not attract him any longer. Thus came to an end Tolstoy's first attempt to write Koni's story.[84] It took many years before the story, which in 1887 had made such a deep impression on Tolstoy, received, in Resurrection, its final form as the world knows it today.[85]

Another work of Tolstoy based on a law case in which Koni had played a part was the unfinished play The Living Corpse, published only posthumously, and which aroused much discussion with regard to its form and content.[86]

The events on which this play was based go back to the early 1880's when Catherine S., the eighteen-year-old daughter of a retired officer, married a young nobleman, Nicholas G., and had a son by him.[87] The first years of the marriage were happy, but afterwards disagreements began which led to the separation of the young couple. The husband soon began to drink heavily and lost his position. After the death of his mother, who had given him both financial and moral support, other relatives came to his rescue and were willing to find some occupation for him, provided that he would give up drinking. But it was too late; he was unable to overcome his weakness. Having thus forfeited the sympathy of his family, he sank lower and lower. In the meantime, his wife had completed a course of studies and was now employed in a clinic near Moscow; there she met a certain Ch., who wanted to marry her. This was not possible for them, because the law considered her still married. After a long search, Catherine succeeded in locating her husband and persuaded him to give her a divorce, and to take the blame upon himself. It is difficult to determine the motives behind his willingness to help her—whether the hope that she would compensate him with financial assistance, his feeling that their marriage had actually terminated long ago, or perhaps remorse for having been unfaithful to her—but with his consent she applied, in 1895, to the Ecclesiastical Court in Moscow for a divorce on the grounds of adultery. During the hearings Nicholas G. confirmed his wife's allegations and produced witnesses, but the court denied the divorce. However, the Metropol-

itan of Moscow, who had the final word in this matter, disagreed with the verdict and ordered the court to interrogate the husband's witnesses, whom the court had not called. But Catherine was under the impression that the verdict of the court was final and that marriage to the man she loved was impossible.

Two weeks later the police found near an ice-hole in the Moskva River an old coat, in the pocket of which were some papers belonging to Nicholas G. and a note asking that no one be blamed for his death. The following day Catherine received a letter from her husband in which he wrote that, despairing of life, he had decided to commit suicide. She took this letter to the police and was invited to look at the corpse of a drowned man just pulled out of the river. Catherine identified him as her husband; when asked by the police why the corpse was in the uniform of an engineer, she explained that her husband in his moments of drunkenness often pawned his clothes and wore whatever he could get hold of. She arranged for the funeral and soon afterwards received an official decree giving her the status of widow. Her marriage to Ch. took place not long afterwards.

A few months later the Governor of St. Petersburg received an application in which Nicholas G. requested the issuance of a new passport, since his old one had been lost. When questioned by the Police Inspector he confessed that he had not lost the passport; the document, he told the Inspector, must be in the archives of the Moscow Ecclesiastical Court or among the papers found in the overcoat picked up at the Moskva River. He also explained what had happened at the time of his "suicide." Catherine, despairing of getting the divorce, had persuaded him to help her obtain a statement confirming his death. Luckily for her, a corpse of a real suicide was found in the river. A few days later Catherine put him on the train to St. Petersburg and kept her promise to send him money regularly. Nicholas and Catherine were brought before the Criminal Court; she was accused of bigamy and he of complicity. Found guilty, they were sentenced to forfeiture of all civil rights and exile in Siberia. The Supreme Court of Appeal confirmed this verdict.

Koni was a member of the Supreme Court which sat in this case. Although agreeing with the opinion of the majority that from the strictly legal point of view the defendants' guilt was proved, Koni felt that the strict application of the law to them and particularly to Catherine was extremely cruel. In his opinion, this was a case in which there existed a deep conflict between the abstract truth, as seen by the law, and the "human" truth. Through corres-

pondence with friends in Moscow Koni found out the details of the case. His correspondents were of the opinion that the defendants certainly would have been acquitted if there had been a trial by jury; they also thought that the exile to Siberia with Nicholas would be cruelly intolerable for Catherine. Koni persuaded the Chief Prosecutor of the Supreme Court to approach the Minister of Justice with the suggestion that the defendants be pardoned or that the sentence be reduced, a procedure which had been initiated by Koni while he himself occupied this post. Koni also called personally upon the Minister, and as a result of all his efforts, Alexander III approved the Minister's resolution to reduce the punishment to one year in prison without loss of civil rights. One of Koni's friends wrote him from Moscow: "Catherine, who was taken in custody today, asked me to convey to you her warm gratitude for everything you did for her. Because of her poor health she will be detained in the prison hospital where she will work as a medical aide."

When Tolstoy heard about this case[88]—one of those dramas which are not infrequent in the annals of the criminal courts—he became so interested that he immediately began to outline, using these materials, a play, The Living Corpse, which he at first called The Corpse.[89] In 1900, according to his diary, his thoughts frequently returned to this case. Koni was of the opinion that Tolstoy never considered the play completed.[90] During his visit to Yasnaya Polyana in 1904 he asked Tolstoy to let him read the manuscript of The Corpse, but Tolstoy remarked: "No, it is not worth reading. It is not finished. And besides, I do not like it and I have given it up completely."[91] Koni doubts whether Tolstoy ever changed his feelings about the play.[92]

VI

As a regular member of the group which met in the office of Vestnik Evropy Koni had the opportunity of becoming closely acquainted with Vladimir Soloviev.[93] People who possess great spirituality are, according to Koni, of two types: either they give clear expression to feelings which people already have but which are not crystallized in their minds, or they voice ideas still foreign to the majority of them. The latter type of thinkers often have to face stubborn opposition in their struggle against the tide of contemporary opinion. To this latter group belonged Soloviev. Koni shares the opinion of Georg Brandes that Soloviev, more than anyone of his day, attracted, amazed, provoked, and fascinated his audiences.[94]

Soloviev made his first public appearance in 1874 at a time when Comte's positivist philosophy was in vogue in Russia. For decades, religious thought, with few exceptions, was confined within the narrow limits of rigid formalism; it was not fashionable to discuss religion, and people seeking answers to religious questions had to look for them in obscure, dogmatic discussions buried in strictly theological journals. Anyone who had the courage to confess openly that such questions were troubling him ran the risk of being considered out of harmony with the times. The appearance of Soloviev in 1874, at the age of twenty-one, as lecturer at the University of Moscow was a momentous event in Russian intellectual life. "It is high time to manifest indifference to the limited interests of this life and to profess freely one's faith in another, much more sublime, reality"—this is how he formulated his approach to religion.[95] He held his audiences spellbound not only by the force of his eloquence and his erudition but also by the moral beauty which emanated from his personality. It is fortunate that Koni was able to find the right words to convey the greatness of Soloviev as a teacher.[96] One can well imagine what a blow it must have been to Soloviev and his students when in 1881 the authorities forced him to give up his teaching.

Koni makes some comments on Soloviev's attitude towards Slavophilism.[97] In Soloviev's opinion, this movement had failed not because it attributed to Russia a special mission, but because it did not emphasize sufficiently the moral responsibilities involved in this mission. He contended that the basis of Slavophilism had been not the idea of Christianity, but a narrow patriotism which led the nation from the duty of serving higher ideals and made an idol of the nation itself. Soloviev opposed the tenets of this philosophy, though he had a profound respect for such proponents of Slavophilism as Khomyakov and Ivan Aksakov, whose faith in freedom of conscience and freedom of expression Soloviev devoutly shared.

On several different occasions during the friendly meetings at the home of Stasyulevich, Koni saw the manifestations of those strange, mystic trances which Soloviev occasionally underwent.[98] Sometimes in the midst of a spirited conversation he would suddenly grow silent, stare fixedly into space, and become oblivious of everything around him. In such moments his pale face would become even paler; then a veil would spread over his eyes, and he would seem to be shaking off a vision which had him in its grip. Koni thinks that it was probably at such a moment that he wrote, ten years before the Japanese War, his brooding poem

Pan-Mongolism in which he prophesied that a time would come when "yellow children would play with the shreds of Russian banners."[99] It was also in the Stasyulevich home that Soloviev had a prophetic foreboding of approaching death.

Koni described a dinner party which was arranged by Stasyulevich on May 13, 1900.[100] Koni was late in arriving and found the invited guests already gathered; there was a note of embarrassment in the air. The old poet A. M. Zhemchuzhnikov, a longtime contributor to Vestnik Evropy, refused to stay for dinner because there were thirteen people to be seated. A compromise was found: another place was set and the most recent issue of the review was put there as the fourteenth guest. Zhemchuzhnikov was persuaded to remain, but he defended his superstition by giving his advanced age as an excuse. Soloviev laughingly interrupted him: "But it is usually the youngest one who has to go, and here I am the youngest. So you don't have to worry. If thirteen is such an unlucky number, it is I who should be the victim." Two and a half months later he died.

VII

The personal association between Koni and Chekhov[101] had its beginning in their mutual interest in problems of penology. Koni's feeling of gratitude for the great esthetic pleasure which he found in Chekhov's writings[102] was accompanied by deep appreciation of the great social service rendered by Chekhov in revealing the terrible conditions in the prison camps on the island of Sakhalin.

For a long time Russian society, and even Russian officialdom had for the most part only a vague idea of the conditions existing in the far-off Siberian areas used for penal labor. To be sure, in 1829, the Government set up district prison committees, but they were charged with the supervision of local prisons, and their authority did not extend to prisons and camps in Siberia. It was only in the 1860's that a more serious public interest in the fate of convicts sent to Siberia was aroused when Dostoevsky's House of Death appeared. Several other books published in the second half of the nineteenth century shed additional light on the miserable conditions existing in the Siberian places of confinement, and the Russian public was thus given a rather complete picture of the penal system as practised in Siberia.[103] But as for the forced labor camp established on Sakhalin in 1875, only the Department of Prisons knew what was going on there; for the general public Sakhalin was shrouded in mystery.

Chekhov, searching for means to improve the living conditions of convicts, came upon the idea of substituting colonies for prisons and forced labor camps. He believed that such a colonization plan could be developed on Sakhalin, and in order to investigate this possibility, he undertook in 1890 the difficult journey to this remote island, a journey which involved many hardships and seriously affected his health. The harrowing impressions gathered there convinced Chekhov that his plans were unrealistic. He concluded that no colonization could be developed there because all the deep-rooted evils of the Siberian penal system had been transplanted from the mainland to Sakhalin, where the convicts were chanting: "All around is the sea and in the middle is misery." The tragedies which Chekhov saw and which he described in his book The Island of Sakhalin[104] added to his profound disillusionment in his cherished project. After his trip to Sakhalin but before the book was published, Chekhov paid a visit to Koni, and it was this visit which marked the beginning of their friendship. The two men spent a long evening talking about Chekhov's trip to the Far East.[105] For several years Koni had been an active member of the Society for the Protection of the Families of Convicts; as a result of Chekhov's visit Koni raised the question of extending the activities of the Society to Sakhalin, and it was decided to do so.[106] Koni always felt that Chekhov's revelations of the gruesome conditions in Sakhalin attracted the attention not only of the public but also of the Ministry of Justice and contributed to the subsequent sending by the latter of several official investigations of the Sakhalin labor camp. Koni, who himself had given much attention to these problems, was keenly aware of the great debt which Russian society owed to Chekhov for his idealistic efforts to help humanity.[107]

In 1896 Chekhov's Sea Gull had its première at the Alexandrinsky Theatre in St. Petersburg. The play was completely misunderstood by the audience; there were catcalls and whistles, and laughter broke out in moments of high emotional tension. Koni considered the play an outstanding one, and he was indignant over the reception given it. His first reaction was one of anxiety for the effect of this fiasco on Chekhov; he remembered the pain caused Glinka and Bizet by similar failures.[108] He felt the urge to communicate some words of encouragement; after reading the next day's hostile reviews he sent a letter to Chekhov.[109] In his reply Chekhov wrote:

> You cannot imagine how happy your letter made me. I saw only the first two acts of my play from the front of the theatre, and after that I sat behind the stage

> thinking all the time that The Sea Gull was a failure. After the play people persuaded me that I had portrayed only idiots, that the play was clumsy from the scenic point of view, that it was stupid, incomprehensible, even senseless, etc. You can imagine my position; it was a failure I could not even have imagined. Some letters arrived, signed and unsigned, in which the play was praised and the reviewers blamed. I read them with pleasure, and yet I felt ashamed and annoyed; the thought stole into my head that if decent people found it necessary to console me, it meant that things were going badly for me. But your letter had a decisive effect upon me. I have known you for a long time. I have a deep respect for you and trust you more than all the critics put together. You felt it when you wrote your letter, and that is why it is so wonderful and convincing. Now I feel calm and can think of the play and of its presentation without any disgust.... Permit me to thank you for it with all my heart. Believe me that I appreciate the feelings which urged you to write me more than I can tell you in words, and I will never, never forget, no matter what happens, the sympathy which you say I do not need.[110]

During the ensuing years Chekhov and Koni met off and on and were in fairly regular correspondence.[111] Chekhov's health was by that time seriously impaired and the thought of the approaching end must have occurred to him frequently. But Chekhov never gave any indication in his works or in his private correspondence that he feared death—in contrast to Turgenev, who on many occasions expressed terror before the inevitability and cruelty of the end, as if in anticipation of his own painful death. In his contacts with writers Koni had opportunities to observe their attitude toward death; Koni had great admiration for the courage of Chekhov, who as a physician must have known very well how close to death he was.[112]

VIII

A contemporary writer with whom Koni did not have intimate personal contact but whom he knew well and deeply respected was Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich, the second cousin of Nicholas II, and who is known in Russian literature by his initials "K. R."[113] Koni had ample opportunity to meet "K. R.," who for years was President of the Academy of Sciences. When in 1900 a Section of Belles-Lettres was established in the Academy as a

memorial to Pushkin, "K. R." and Koni were among the nine honorary academicians elected to this Section.

A prominent member of the Imperial family, "K. R." performed many official duties as Commander of the Izmaylovsky Guard Regiment and active adviser on pedagogical matters in military institutions, but he found the time and energy to cultivate the two arts to which he was devoted: music and poetry. He set to music a number of the poems of A. K. Tolstoy, A. N. Maykov, and Victor Hugo; for years he was the very active President of the Russian Society of Music. His love of music was the link between him and Tchaikovsky, and it was the latter who advised "K. R." to look in the Gospels for a subject for a major work.

"K. R." was the founder of an art group in the Izmaylovsky Regiment called Izmailovskii dosug. This group made a considerable contribution to the artistic life in the capital. Particularly important was the series of dramatic performances which included hitherto unstaged plays, operas, and vaudeville sketches.[114]

"K. R." was an original writer, and also a very talented translator. He translated into Russian such classics as Goethe's Iphigenia in Tauris and Schiller's Bride of Messina. His crowning achievement in this field was the translation of Hamlet, which is still one of the best in Russian. It is accompanied by critical annotations, commentaries, and essays which retain great value for the student of Shakespeariana.[115]

A person of profound religious feeling, "K. R." for many years dreamed of finding an adequate expression for this feeling in the form of a dramatic work. In this way his play King of Judaea was conceived. It was not his intention to write a mystery play which would follow closely the Biblical text. In his portrayal of the last day of Christ's earthly life, "K. R." used the device which was later adopted by Maeterlinck in his Mary Magdalene. Christ does not appear in the play but His presence is constantly felt. The play has a powerful dramatic appeal; the accompanying music was written by Glazunov, and when the drama was presented on the stage of the Hermitage Theatre in St. Petersburg, it was "K. R." who played the leading part of Joseph. Koni in his description of the play emphazises its great social significance: it was presented to the public at a time when the literary tone in Russia was set by authors who catered to the decadent tastes of the period and when the repertory of the theatres reflected a deterioration of public morals.[116]

The King of Judaea was "K.R." 's last major work. Koni believes that his death in the summer of 1915 was precipitated by two family tragedies: his young son, Prince Oleg, an ardent admirer of Pushkin and the publisher of the facsimiles of some of Pushkin's manuscripts, perished on the front in World War I, and soon afterwards his son-in-law, Prince Bagration-Mukhransky, was also killed in battle.

IX

Koni's memory was a rich storehouse of interesting facts and episodes which he willingly opened to others. Among those who shared in the memories of his experiences in the courts was A. N. Apukhtin, a poet who left some beautiful lyrics of deep and moving sadness, but who is now almost entirely forgotten.[117]

Apukhtin once heard Koni discuss the question of suicides in St. Petersburg; Koni, as Public Prosecutor, was well acquainted with them. At a later meeting with Koni, Apukhtin returned to this subject, and since Apukhtin was greatly interested in it, Koni sent him a story of a suicide which he later published under the title The Lost Earring.[118] The heroine was a poor young woman left destitute by her lover, the father of her two children. The woman, thought by her neighbors to be a widow, struggled to give her children an education. Her life was further complicated by a series of sad events: she developed a disease which forced her to give up her work as a seamstress; her son failed to pass the entrance examination for high school; and, what was hardest for her to bear, her fifteen-year-old daughter was accused by a roomer of stealing a diamond earring. Disregarding the pleas of the mother, the accuser informed the police, and during the investigation everyone learned that the woman was not in fact a widow but an unmarried woman with two illegitimate children. This was the final blow. She committed suicide and in her last letter swore that her daughter was innocent. When the supposed victim of the theft moved to another house, the earring was found among her possessions.

When Apukhtin read the story he wrote to Koni: " The case is indeed dramatic, but the real drama lies in the fact that the irresponsible action of the roomer might be looked upon as a blessing for the poor heroine. If the earring affair had not occurred, she might have for a long time kept on dragging out her miserable existence, which was worse than poison. In my opinion suicide is not a crime and often does not show lack of courage;

on the contrary, it is frequently the sensible solution. I would like to talk more to you about it." [119]

When they met again, Apukhtin said that he would like to make use of this episode, and he added: "I will also bring you in." Koni did not take this seriously, but after a year Apukhtin notified him that the poem was written and that he did not feel justified in publishing it without first reading it to Koni. Soon afterwards Apukhtin dragged his enormous bulk, the target of many jokes,[120] up the four flights of stairs to Koni's apartment and read him the poem The Last Night, which he later re-named From the Papers of a Public Prosecutor.[121]

X

A close friendship over many years existed between Koni and the actor Ivan Fedorovich Gorbunov,[122] who acquired an enormous popularity as an inimitable narrator of short stories in which he impersonated a variety of characters. In this genre Gorbunov was unexcelled, and for decades his name remained extremely popular with theatre-goers in the big cities and in almost all the provincial towns. A connoisseur of Russian life both before and after the Great Reforms, Gorbunov portrayed in his sketches the little people— workers, peasants, merchants, petty governmental officials, and minor representatives of the clergy. Koni admired Gorbunov for his subtle understanding of the customs of a rapidly changing society.

Within a few years after Gorbunov's death Koni observed how ephemeral his fame was. His name now meant very little to those who had not known him personally or had not seen him perform. And yet Gorbunov was not only an exceptionally talented performer but a writer of considerable note; he was the author of all the material he used on the stage. In it he showed an exceptional command of the Russian language, with its endless nuances to suit each of the human types portrayed by him.[123] Koni took upon himself the difficult task of reconstructing, from the bits he recalled, some of Gorbunov's stories. This mosaic, which is woven into Koni's masterly study on Gorbunov, presents a very valuable addition to the literary legacy of this artist.[124] Koni, who himself left many colorful pictures of life in old Russia, must have worked on this portrait with great emotion; his study on Gorbunov revives the writer as well as the actor and brings back the fascination which he had for the audience.

Gorbunov's sketches of Russian life in its infinite variety revealed, among other things, the attitude of the little people toward the law.[125] Gorbunov was well acquainted with the old courts and the parasites who clung to it, but he also was an interested observer of the new courts which came into being after 1864. He at once saw the importance of the changes because they did away with the chaos and injustice of the old courts and had a wholesome effect on public morals. He became a regular visitor to the courtrooms and was particularly interested in trials by jury. He followed attentively the important cases of the day; his enthusiasm was aroused by trials like that of the millionaire Ovsyannikov, who was accused of arson to collect a large amount of insurance,[126] or the trial of the Mother Superior Mitrofania, who, in spite of her powerful social connections, was brought to court for forging checks;[127] he understood that formerly these guilty persons would have gone unpunished. There can be no doubt that Gorbunov often consulted Koni about the details of the new legal procedure and that Koni proffered his expert advice. Gorbunov realized that the new courts, suddenly superimposed on old customs and habits, often produced comic situations. With his keen sense of humor he portrayed these incongruities, but there is no trace of malicious ridicule in any of his court sketches.

Helsingin Yliopisto
Kirjaston, Slaavilainen Osasto

Notes

1. The present study, which is part of a larger work on Koni's contribution to the history of Russian society under the last four Romanovs, deals with one group of Koni's contemporaries—the Russian writers of his day, many of whom were his personal friends.

2. A. F. Koni was born on January 22, 1844, and died on September 17, 1927. His father, Fedor Alexeevich Koni, was a well-known playwright, journalist, and historian of the Russian theatre; he published some of the best monthly reviews of the middle decades of the last century, and he was particularly prominent as the author of vaudeville sketches which enjoyed great popularity. Koni's mother, Irina Semenovna Sandunova-Koni, was a talented dramatic actress, as well as a novelist of some renown. Soon after his graduation from the University of Moscow Koni joined the judiciary, where he was active for forty-one years. One of the greatest orators who ever appeared before the Russian courts, he knew how to strike a delicate balance between the content and the form of his speeches. He was particularly skillful in his ad-

dresses to the jury; his subtle and penetrating analyses of cases were completely free of any tendency to point an accusing finger. A resolute enemy of dogmatism and lifeless formalism, Koni, as public speaker, teacher, and writer stressed the importance of ethical principles. His credo is well expressed in his words: "Where justice and due process of law do not form an entity, the moral foundation of social life is threatened."

3. Koni's essays on contemporary writers are contained in the five volumes of his memoirs, Na zhiznennom puti. In the present study the second editions of Volume I (Moscow. 1913) and Volume II (St. Petersburg, 1913) are used. Volume III (Reval-Berlin, 1922; this volume was originally planned in two parts, of which the second part did not appear; it is therefore referred to as Volume III), Volume IV (Reval-Berlin, 1923), and Volume V (published posthumously, Leningrad, 1929) are all the original editions. In this study reference is made to each volume by its respective number Included in Koni's memoirs are two studies on Pushkin: "Nravstvennyi oblik Pushkina" (IV, 3-44), and "Stranichka iz zhizni Pushkina" (IV, 45-58).

4. After the October Revolution of 1917 Koni, in spite of his advanced years and failing health, gave frequent public lectures on Pushkin and the writers he had known personally. The writer about whom he lectured most frequently was Nekrasov. His audiences were heterogeneous—factory workers, soldiers, sailors, students, etc.—and followed him with great interest. Koni used these occasions to acquaint the new post-Revolutionary audiences with the cultural traditions of his generation.

5. Koni on Odoevskii: "Kn. Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevskii," IV, 59-93.

6. Skazki i razskazy Dedushki Irineia (Moscow, 1895).

7. Russkiia nochi, ed. S. A. Tsvetkov (Moscow, 1913), pp. 97-110.

8. Russkiia nochi, pp. 334-335.

9. Russkiia nochi, pp. 342-346, 416-418.

10. The cantata began with the following words: "Vyshla novaia novinka,/ Veselisia russkii khor,/ Etot Glinka, etot Glinka/ Uzh ne glinka, a farfor" (V, 169); the text was written by Pushkin, Vyazemsky, and Vielgorsky.

11. "Poslednii kvartet Betkhovena," Russkiia nochi, pp. 187-198; "Improvizator," ibid., pp. 203-226; "Sebastian Bakh," ibid., pp. 241-304.

12. About Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna see IV, 263-321.

13. Odoevsky's admiration for the court reforms under Alexander II, and particularly the new court procedure of trial by jury, is expressed in the following words: "A jury is good not because it decides more justly and more independently than an appointed judge. It might well happen that a wise official would examine a

case more logically and decide it more justly than a member of a jury without any legal training. . . . Trial by jury is important because it brings home to people the idea of justice through the law, an idea the importance of which they had never suspected. It develops conscience. All that is beautiful and sublime in English law, the courts of justice, police, customs—all this sprang from trial by jury; that is, from the opportunity everyone has to act some day as a free judge of his neighbor, but to act openly, exposed to the criticism of public opinion. Social truth is never achieved where the judge is an appointee who might expect from his superior a reward or a punishment for his verdict." (IV, 90.)

14. IV, 92-93.

15. Koni on Turgenev: "Turgenev," II, 77-96; "Pamiati Turgeneva," II, 407-445; "Pokhorony Turgeneva," IV, 214-237; "Vestnik Evropy," II, 223-225; Turgenev i Savina: Pis'ma I. S. Turgeneva k M. G. Savinoi: Vospominaniia M. G. Savinoi ob I. S. Turgeneve, s predisloviem i pod redaktsiei A. F. Koni, pri blizhaishem sotrudnichestve A. E. Molchanova (Petrograd, 1918), pp. xxxviii, 114.

16. This case is described by Koni in his essay "Metody i tseli obvineniia," I, 143-145.

17. II, 79-80.

18. Koni's close association with this review and the many writers who contributed to it is described in "Vestnik Evropy," II, 193-235.

19. II, 80.

20. "Pergamskiia raskopki" (1880), Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I. S. Turgeneva, 5th ed. (St. Petersburg, 1911), X, 197-202.

21. On the relationship between Turgenev and Viardot see Turgenev i Savina, pp. xix-xxi.

22. II, 81-85.

23. II, 85-87. On Turgenev's attitude towards marriage see Turgenev i Savina, p. xix.

24. On B. N. Chicherin, under whom Koni studied political science at the University of Moscow, see "Iz let iunosti i starosti," III, 178-184.

25. II, 87-88.

26. For a description of the Pushkin celebrations in Moscow in 1880, see II, 88-95.

27. IV, 237.

28. The authorities interfered with the public manifestations in Turgenev's memory after his funeral. The Society of Lovers of Russian Literature at the University of Moscow planned a memorial meeting with the participation of Leo Tolstoy. At the suggestion of E. M. Feoktistov, the chief of the Censorship Office, who considered Tolstoy an "insane person capable of anything," the meeting was called off. (IV, 224-225)

29. Among Turgenev's detractors who were criticized by Koni (IV, 235-237) were A. Ya. Golovacheva-Panaeva, the author of Vospominaniia: Russkie pisateli i artisty 1824-1870 (St. Petersburg, 1890) in which Chapters 14-16 are particularly venomous, and A. Fet, Moi vospominaniia, Parts I and II (Moscow, 1890). See also the exchange of letters between Koni and Savina in M. Savina i A. Koni: Perepiska 1883-1915: Vstupitel'naia stat'ia i primechaniia A. M. Brianskogo (Leningrad, Moscow, 1938) (letters Nos. 114 and 115, pp. 83-84) concerning the bitter attack against Turgenev in the essay by Boris Sadovsky, "I. S. Turgenev: Opyt istoriko-psikhologicheskago izsledovaniia," Russkii arkhiv, 1909, No. 4, pp. 601-629 (based almost entirely on the writings of the two above-named detractors of Turgenev). Koni's contribution to a just interpretation of Turgenev's complicated nature is recognized by I. M. Grevs in "I. S. Turgenev v pis'makh k Polonskim," in Anatolii Fedorovich Koni: 1844-1924: Iubileinyi sbornik (Leningrad, 1925), p. 141.

30. Turgenev "had the full right to shed joyful tears of inner satisfaction at the church service arranged by him and the old Prince Volkonsky, the Decembrist, in Paris on the occasion of the liberation of the peasants" (Koni, in Turgenev i Savina, p. xiii).

31. Upon learning of Turgenev's death, Koni wrote to M. G. Savina: "When we lose a person who is dear to us, who awoke the best in our souls, who illuminated and sanctified many of life's problems for us, our thoughts naturally fly to the one who was dear to him, whom he loved, who consoled him and inspired him" (M. Savina i A. Koni, letter No. 7 of August 27, 1883, p. 25). Koni's mother had a great influence on the artistic development of the young Savina, but in later years this great actress owed much to Koni himself for her general intellectual development: "If Savina's familiarity with literature and her general culture were impressive and if she became a European actress of first rank, this was certainly due in large part to Koni, who without her being aware of it awoke in her serious interests which had a beneficial influence on her not only as a person but as an artist" (M. Savina i A. Koni, pp 17-18).

32. Koni on Dostoevsky: "F. M. Dostoevskii," IV, 238-262; "F. M. Dostoevskii," V, 23-41; "O F. M. Dostoevskom," V, 321-329; "Eshche o Dostoevskom," V, 329-336.

33. V, 26.

34. On January 12, 1866, when the issue of Russkii vestnik containing the first part of Crime and Punishment was off the press but had not yet been distributed, a student by the name of Alexey Danilov in Moscow murdered Popov, a money-lender, and his maid, Nordman. Two years later, on March 1, 1868, a young man, Vitold Gorsky, in Tambov during an attempted robbery murdered six persons; cf. V. S. Dorovatovskaya-Lyubimova, "Idiot Dostoevskogo i ugolovnaia khronika ego vremeni," Pechat' i revoliutsiia, Mos-

cow, 1928, No. 3, pp. 31-53. About a murder similar to that by Danilov, committed on May 25, 1879, in St. Petersburg by the young guard officer Karl Landsberg, see Koni, "Landsberg," I, 266-284, and V. M. Doroshevich, Sakhalin (Prestupniki), Part II (Moscow, 1905), pp. 76-85.

35. Grazhdanin, No. 5, January 29, 1873, "The Kirghiz Deputies in St. Petersburg." See V, 27-28.

36. For details of this case cf. Iu. G. Oksman, "F. M. Dostoevskii v redaktsii Grazhdanina," in Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo, (Odessa, 1921), pp. 70-71, and Vospominaniia A. G. Dostoevskoi, ed. L. P. Grossman, (Moscow, 1925), pp. 180-181.

37. V, 28-29.

38. Dnevnik pisatelia, Ch. 1: "Prostoe, no mudrenoe delo," October 1876 (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii F. M. Dostoevskago [St. Petersburg: "Prosveshchenie," 1911], XX, 317-323), and Ch. 1: "Opiat' o prostom, no mudrenom dele," December 1876 (ibid., pp. 387-395); Ch. 2: "Osvobozhdenie podsudimoi Kornilovoi," April 1877 (ibid., XXI, 136-139).

39. Soon after the Kornilova affair, a Mrs. A. Bergeman brought Dostoevsky's attention to the case of an eleven-year-old girl, Marfusha, abandoned by her mother to the care of the mother's former lover, a depraved drunkard. He sent the girl out into the streets to collect alms and beat her when the collection was meager. According to the mother, he had announced his attention to abuse her "when she was ripe." Dostoevsky approached Koni about this case and gathered all the necessary data. Dostoevsky himself communicated with the Governor of St. Petersburg and the Public Prosecutor, and the girl was removed to an orphanage. (V, 30.)

40. For description of the Pushkin celebrations in Moscow in 1880 see "Turgenev," II, 88-95; Dostoevsky's address is described in II, 93-95 (reprinted in V, 34-36).

41. V, 36-37.

42. About Dostoevsky's death and funeral see V, 40-41.

43. In "F. M. Dostoevskii," "O F. M. Dostoevskom," and "Eshche o Dostoevskom."

44. Cf. "Ugolovnaya politika," III, 581-594 (particularly pp. 583-584).

45. On the social importance of Dostoevsky in connection with problems of "criminal policy" raised by him, cf. V. Pereverzev, Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo (Moscow, 1922), pp. 237-239.

46. IV, 238-262.

47. IV, 243.

48. IV, 247-249.

49. IV, 249-252.

50. IV, 253-255.

51. The well-known French criminologist Atalin concluded his lectures with the reminder: "Surtout, messieurs, lisez Dostoyevski!" (V, 336).

52. Pellico, a carbonaro, was arrested by the Austrians in Lombardy in 1820 and became perhaps the most famous of the "martyrs of the Spielberg"; in Le Mie Prigioni, published in 1832, he described the eight years spent in prisons in Moravia and in Venice. Thanks largely to his book the Spielberg fortress near Brno which had been used as a dreaded prison since 1742, was transformed into barracks in 1855, the year following Pellico's death. On Dostoevsky and Pellico see V, 332.

53. See IV, 256-257, and V, 327-329. The visit of Dostoevsky and Koni to a colony for juvenile delinquents near St. Petersburg in the summer of 1877 is described in V, 30-34.

54. IV, 256; V, 39, 327.

55. IV, 253.

56. Koni on Nekrasov: "Nikolai Alekseievich Nekrasov," V, 3-22; "Motivy i priemy tvorchestva Nekrasova (Beglye zametki)," V, 317-320.

57. V, 5.

58. The elder Koni helped Nekrasov in the years 1840-41. As a contributor to Koni's review, Nekrasov wrote vaudeville sketches and literary criticism: see "Nekrasov i Koni" in V. Evgen'ev-Maksimov, N. A. Nekrasov i ego sovremenniki: Ocherki (Moscow, 1930), pp. 7-43; also see V, 4-5.

59. Nekrasov wrote to F. A. Koni on August 16, 1841: "Now I realize that I have been able to climb out of the filth only because of your help . . . . I am not ashamed to admit that I owe everything to you. . . ." (Evgen'ev-Maksimov, Nekrasov i ego sovremenniki, p. 15.)

60. Concerning this poem, which was very dear to Nekrasov's heart and into which he poured all his feelings and experiences, trying to make of it a "people's book," see P. N. Sakulin, N. A. Nekrasov (Moscow, 1928), pp. 50-52, and "Kak Nekrasov predpolagal zakonchit' svoiu poemu Komu na Rusi zhit' khorosho," in N. A. Nekrasov, 1878-1938: Sbornik statei i materialov, ed. V. E. Evgen'ev-Maksimov (Leningrad, 1938), pp. 397-399.

61. V, 7.

62. V, 10-11.

63. Cf. "Real'nye osnovy novelly 'Pro kholopa primernogo, Iakova vernogo' (Komu na Rusi zhit' khorosho)" in N. A. Nekrasov, 1878-1938, pp. 394-397.

64. V, 13-14.

65. See "Igornyi dom Kolemina," I, 70-78.

66. The details of this conversation, which Koni did not include in his memoirs on Nekrasov, were related by him to V. E. Evgen'ev-Maksimov and are told by the latter in his Nekrasov i ego sovremenniki, pp. 37-38.

67. Ibid., p. 36.

68. After the death of Nekrasov's sister, Anna Alexeevna Butkevich, in 1882, Koni came into possession of the poet's personal archives. In contrast to some other guardians of literary and historical archives, who are reluctant to share them with other scholars, Koni was always willing to put Nekrasov's archive at the disposal of interested persons.

69. As mentioned above in note 4, Koni's favorite topic for the lectures which he often gave after the Revolution was Nekrasov's life and work. This is how Evgen'ev-Maksimov describes the contribution which Koni made to perpetuate Nekrasov's memory: "Without fear of being accused of exaggeration, we can assert that 'the Nekrasov days' (the hundredth anniversary of the poet's birth) in December 1921 in Leningrad assumed the importance of a great social and literary event . . . because Koni's deep interest in Nekrasov's memory gave life to the celebration" (Nekrasov i ego sovremenniki, pp. 41-42).

70. Koni on Tolstoy: "Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi," II, 3-56 (covering the years up to 1907); "Po povodu dramaticheskikh proizvedenii Tolstogo," II, 57-76.

71. Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Kuzminsky, the husband of Tolstoy's sister-in-law, Tatiana Andreevna (author of Moia zhizn' doma i v Iasnoi Poliane: Vospominaniia), succeeded Koni as Presiding Judge of the St. Petersburg District Court after Koni's removal from this post in connection with the case of Vera Zasulich. About Koni's first visit to Yasnaya Polyana see II, 8-33.

72. II, 21-25, 34-35, 43-44.

73. II, 35-36.

74. II, 38.

75. II, 46-49.

76. During Koni's last visit to Yasnaya Polyana, Tolstoy and he were talking about the vain pursuit of happiness, so often cut short by sudden death. These thoughts were prompted by a story Koni had been telling Tolstoy about a government official whose fondest dream was to have a fine dress uniform with gold embroidery. After many sacrifices he finally acquired the uniform. Waiting for an opportunity to shine in it, he packed it away carefully in moth balls for the summer. The next fall, on the occasion of the St. George Festival, he unpacked his treasure, only to discover that the embroidery was completely tarnished. A few months later he died. When he heard this story, Tolstoy remarked: "This image

is much more eloquent than long discussions, and one should really use it sometime." (II, pp. 49-50.)

77. II, 51-54.

78. Koni was deeply interested in the safeguarding of freedom of worship; as a member of the judiciary and later as a member of the State Council, he often participated actively in cases where he raised his voice in defense of this freedom; cf. "Uniatskiia dela," I, 572-599; "Shtundisty," I, 600-631; "Pastorskiia dela," I, 632-654; "O staroobriadcheskikh obshchinakh," II, 535-558; "O perekhode iz odnogo ispovedaniia very v drugoe," II, 559-583; "Ob otmene ogranichenii, svyazannykh s ostavleniem dukhovnogo sana," II, 583-602; "V. G. Korolenko i sud," V, 291-297, 360, notes. (This concerns the Multan case of 1894 in which several peasants were accused of human sacrifice for religious purposes. This case brought Korolenko and Koni together.)

79. II, 54.

80. II, 25-31; cf. V. Sreznevskii, "'Kónevskaia povest'' L. N. Tolstogo," in Anatolii Fedorovich Koni 1844-1924: Iubileinyi sbornik (Leningrad, 1925), pp. 40-56.

81. Sreznevsky, p. 40.

82. As Biryukov, Tolstoy's biographer, points out, an unforgettable episode in the writer's past might have been the reason for his special interest in "Koni's story," as he always called it. "To demonstrate the autobiographical feature of the novel I must relate a meeting I had with L. N. and thus fulfil a legacy which he left me. In August 1910, three months before his death, I visited him in Yasnaya Polyana. The feeling of reverence which I felt for him often prevented me from disturbing him with questions about his life. With his sensitive nature he guessed my feelings and he often himself began to talk, always adding: 'This will be of help to you in your work.' . . . [One morning Tolstoy said to Biryukov:] 'You always write only the good things about me; this is not correct and not complete. You should write also the bad things. In my youth I lived a very bad life, and two episodes from that period torture me up to now. I tell you this as my biographer and I ask you to mention it in my biography. These episodes were: a liaison with a peasant woman from our village, before my marriage; this is hinted at in my story The Devil; the other episode is a crime which I committed with Masha, a maid in my aunt's house. She was innocent, I seduced her, she was dismissed, and she perished.' This might explain the emotion which he brought to this subject and the fervor which drove him to complete and to publish this novel [Resurrection] out of many works which he had started. . . ." (P. I. Biriukov, L. N. Tolstoi: Biografiia, III, [Berlin, 1921], 564-565.) See Sreznevsky, p. 44.

83. The following episode sheds interesting light on the history of Tolstoy's Resurrection: "That winter [1889: According to Tolstoy's diary he began to write 'Koni's story' in December of that year; cf. Sreznevsky, pp. 46-47] L. N. decided to write his famous

novel Resurrection. He told us about it under the following circumstances. One evening among the guests in his house were Professor Masaryk and Ertel. In the course of their conversation Tolstoy, addressing Ertel, remarked: 'You young writers always complain that there are no topics, whereas in fact there are many; here, for instance, is a topic—a story from real life which a friend of mine, a lawyer, told me.' And then L. N. recited the story of Resurrection. Ertel replied: 'How can we undertake a theme like that? Only Dostoevsky and you, Lev Nikolaevich, can do it justice.' I walked home that night with A. B. and Professor Masaryk, and we talked continuously about how wonderful it would be if Tolstoy really wrote a novel on this theme. After a few days A. B. and I called on L. N. and began to tell him about our conversation with Professor Masaryk. Two weeks later, during another visit with Tolstoy, he told us: 'I have decided to write the story and have already written a letter asking permission to use the theme.'" (Article signed "V. R.," "L. N. Tolstoi i 'Tolstovstvo' v kontse 80-kh i nachale 90-kh gg.," Minuvshie gody, 1908, No. 9, p. 16.)

84. The manuscript of Tolstoy's story shows that he had actually followed his original plan to present the developments of the story in their chronological order; in this respect the first draft of "Koni's story" differed from the plan adopted by Tolstoy later in his Resurrection; see Sreznevsky, pp. 47-48.

85. Although many years separate the completion of Resurrection (1889-1899) from the first draft of "Koni's story," some passages of the latter are almost identical with the text of Resurrection; Tolstoy obviously used the first draft when he wrote the novel: Sreznevsky, p. 49.

86. II, 57-67.

87. II, 58-65.

88. The case was brought to Tolstoy's attention by N. V. Davydov, former Presiding Judge of the Moscow District Court (II, 65). On Davydov, who also recounted to Tolstoy the case which became the subject of Power of Darkness, see "N. V. Davydov," III, 392-394.

89. II, 66.

90. II, 66-67. Koni's opinion was shared by M. G. Savina who played the part of the elderly society matron, Anna Dmitrievna Karenina; in a letter to Koni dated September 4, 1911, she remarked: "We are rehearsing The Corpse, but it is a real corpse from the point of view of staging, and Tolstoy understood that well when he kept it off the stage. It isn't even an outline of a play; it is only a rough sketch." In reply Koni wrote her, on September 11, 1911, that "Tolstoy himself would scarcely have decided to present it in such an unfinished state." (M. Savina i A. Koni, Letters Nos. 122 and 124, pp. 86-87.)

91. II, 67.

92. In the first act of the play in its original form there was a coachman named Turetsky. The prototype of this character, also named Turetsky, was the owner of a fleet of cabs (likhachi) and was well known in Old Moscow because he was helpful in tracking down wealthy landowners who had come to the big city and had gotten lost in its gay places. During Koni's first visit to Yasnaya Polyana, Tolstoy told him stories about this colorful figure: II, 66-67.

93. Koni on Soloviev: "Vladimir Sergeevich Solov'ev," IV, 94-139; "Vestnik Evropy," II, 217-223.

94. IV, 97.

95. IV, 110.

96. II, 125-127.

97. II, 118-122.

98. II, 221-222.

99. This poem, written in October 1894 (Sergei Solov'ev, "Biografiia V. S. Solov'eva," in V. Solov'ev, Stikhotvoreniia (6th ed., Moscow, 1915), p. 39, contained the following stanza: "O Rus', zabud' byluiu slavu:/ Orel dvuglavyi sokrushen/ I zheltym detiam na zabavu/ Dany kloch'i tvoikh znamen" (pp. 287-288).

100. II, 222-223.

101. Koni on Chekhov: "A. P. Chekhov (Otryvochnye vospominaniia)," V, 159-177.

102. Koni was a great admirer of Chekhov's language and style: "When you consider the damage which is being done to our Russian language, both written and spoken, the extent to which foreign words and expressions are unnecessarily invading it. . ., how new words, meaningless and offensive to the ear, are being dragged into the language. . . you cannot give sufficient recognition to Chekhov for the attention and reverence he shows towards the language. . ." (V, 175-176).

103. See George Kennan, Siberia and the Exile System (London, 1891; the first Russian translation of the book appeared in Berlin the same year); L. Mel'shin, V mire otverzhennykh (Zapiski byvshago katorzhnika) (St. Petersburg, 1896).

104. Chekhov's Ostrov Sakhalin (Iz putevykh zapisok) appeared in book form in the summer of 1895; parts of it were published in the volume Pomoshch' golodaiushchim (Moscow, 1892) and in Russkaia mysl' in 1893 and 1894.

105. V, 164-165.

106. Koni quotes excerpts from a letter which Chekhov wrote him after their first meeting; in this letter Chekhov pictures the shocking condition of children on Sakhalin (V, 165-166).

107. The impression made on Koni by Chekhov's book on Sakhalin is described by T. L. Shchepkina-Kupernik, "O Chekhove,"

in Chekhov v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov (Moscow, 1952), p. 277.

108. V, 169; cf. IV, 81.

109. Koni's letter dated October 7, 1896, and found in Chekhov's archive was published for the first time in V, 350 (with annotations by Iu. G. Oksman); although Koni states in his memoirs (V, 168-169) that he wrote Chekhov immediately after attending the first performance of The Sea Gull, the letter itself shows that he was present at one of the later performances and that he had been told about the first-night fiasco by Savina.

110. For the full text of this letter, dated October 11, 1896, see Pis'ma Chekhova, IV (Moscow, 1914), 500-502. Chekhov mentions the impression made on him by Koni's words of encouragement in his letter of December 14, 1896, to A. S. Suvorin: "By your letters you and Koni gave me more than a few good moments" (p. 518).

111. V, 170-173.

112. In Koni's opinion, the familiar comparison of Chekhov with Maupassant is not without justification, but he sees important differences between them. In Maupassant the predominant note is irony in his attitude towards the stupidity, the greed, and the baseness of human nature, whereas in Chekhov one finds only sadness and compassion towards human frailities (see V, 176).

113. Koni on "K. R.": "Pochetnyi Akademik 'K. R.,'" IV, 140-165.

114. The performances by this group were usually given on the stage of the Palace of Pavlovsk, "K. R."'s summer residence. Among other presentations they gave: O, vremia! by Catherine II, Iabeda, by Kapnist, several old vaudeville sketches, and old Russian operas: Mel'nik, koldun, obmanshchik i svat, by Ablesimov, Ivan Susanin, by Kavos, Askol'dova mogila, by Verstovsky. (IV, 145.)

115. IV, 152-154.

116. IV, 161.

117. Koni on Apukhtin: "Apukhtin," II, 125-129.

118. In Nedelia, 1871. This story was based on the suicide case of Emma Gerzau; the official statements and documents pertaining to this case are reproduced by Koni in III, 142-147.

119. II, 127.

120. II, 128.

121. Written in October 1888; see Sochineniia A. N. Apukhtina (4th ed., St. Petersburg, 1900), pp. 253-260.

122. Koni on Gorbunov: "Ivan Fedorovich Gorbunov," V, 42-158.

123. Gorbunov was a serious student of the Russian language,

particularly of the official language used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. On Gorbunov's writings in the style and language of this period, see V, 123-136; among the samples of these writings Koni includes the complete text of a ukase addressed to Koni by Gorbunov: "Ot gosudaria, tsaria i velikago kniazia okol'nichemu nashemu, Anatoliiu Fedorovichu" (V, 125-127).

124. Among Gorbunov's many stories, to the reconstruction of which Koni made important contributions, is a description of a banquet tendered by the Moscow merchants to Captain Fox and the officers of the American battleship, Miantonomo, which paid an official visit to Kronstadt in 1866 (V, 83-84). Koni also preserved important fragments for the reconstruction of "General Dityatin," an imaginary character created by Gorbunov, who often impersonated him, and had him speak on various happenings of the day in an old-fashioned style and language (see V, 103-108).

125. V, 70-78, 124-125.

126. See "Delo Ovsiannikova," I, 17-26.

127. See "Igumenia Mitrofaniia," I, 48-58.

SOVIET THOUGHT IN THE NINETEEN-THIRTIES: AN INTERPRETATIVE SKETCH

by Robert V. Daniels
Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies at Indiana University

In great measure the mysterious character of the Russian enigma can be attributed to the preconceptions into which the outside world has customarily forced the observed facts of Soviet life.[1] Not the least serious among such a priori distortions is the assumption that the affairs of the Soviet government are guided by a fixed system of ideology: both the fixity and the guidance are highly questionable. It is unwarrantable to take the Soviet regime at its face value, whether the positive or negative sign be prefixed.

Surface indications to the contrary, change—of a most fundamental and often unwilled sort—is one of the primary characteristics to be taken account of in dealing with the Soviet regime. The extent of transformation during the Soviet period can nowhere be demonstrated as clearly as in the field of ideological pronouncements and intellectual work—in the realm of thought, if the offhand comments of Soviet leaders and the frenzied exegesis by Agitprop's functionaries can be dignified by the term.

To a quite appreciable extent changes in the various fields of mental activity in Soviet Russia have been noted abroad, but usually such awareness has been confined to specialists' understanding of particular subjects.[2] The aim of this paper is first of all to draw up an over-all picture of the extensive evolution in Soviet thought and to show the correspondences between the developments in various specialized fields. Beyond this objective of describing and emphasizing the kind of general development which can be observed, I shall suggest an explanation of how and why these changes came about and shall discuss what they indicate as to the emergent nature of Soviet society. In this process, perhaps some light can be shed on the puzzling relations between Soviet ideology and action.

The discussion will begin with an exposition of the general pattern of Soviet ideological change since 1929; applications of the pattern to various particular fields will follow. In a paper

attempting, as this does, to present a synthesis of numerous separate fields, it is necessary that the treatment of these special areas rely heavily on work done by specialists in the respective fields. My primary concern is to emphasize the relationships which can be discerned between the conclusions adduced by the various specialists. It should be noted finally that the present paper is not intended as a final statement, but rather as a preliminary sketch.

The Context—Ideology and Politics

Communist ideology and Soviet policy throughout a wide range of social institutions and intellectual activities have changed drastically since the revolution, although the original Marxist terminology has been largely retained and the regime has continued to rationalize itself as the true executor of the Marxian scheme. Soviet society is now a stable, even somewhat rigid, though internally very tense structure, organized in an all-embracing bureaucratic order. In substance, the original revolutionary goal of a free, equalitarian, non-coercive "communist" society has been completely abandoned; for all practical purposes the regime is interested only in maintaining its present stability and authority and in building national power. The social policies dictated by this interest are the diametric opposite of the ideals which inspired the revolution: the Soviet regime is now trying to mold the disciplined, compulsive, authoritarian personalities which make the best cogs in a vast military-industrial machine.[3] In the effort to justify the new stabilized order and the social policies which it has entailed, and to explain away older expectations about the results of the revolution, a truly sweeping revision of ideology has been carried out.

Communist ideology and the stated social aims of the regime remained more or less intact until 1929. Much significant political evolution had taken place by then, to be sure—the framework of the totalitarian state was already erected—but this proceeded under the vague concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat: the developing traits of the Soviet state were described as transitional measures of bureaucratic organization and the employment of violence, necessary to effect the transition from capitalism to socialism. One major revision had been made—Stalin's enunciation of the doctrine of socialism in one country, wherein on the basis of one distorted quotation from Lenin he argued that socialism could be built in Russia in spite of Russia's backwardness and without the aid of a world revolution.[4]

The situation in which the Soviet regime found itself contained powerful forces pressing for change in policy and in doctrine. Russian isolation and backwardness in fact deprived the revolution of the material basis for the socialist society as it had been traditionally envisaged. A different sort of order was called for by the problems Russia faced, and "socialism in one country" provided the ideological smoke screen for the transition. In 1929-30 the new system and the new principles on which it was based emerged—to undertake, driven by the relentless will of one man with an invincible political machine, the solution of the basic problems of economic backwardness and national weakness.

The history of Soviet society from that time on has proceeded largely outside of the compass of the now obviously limited Marxian sociology. Rather than determining the basic form and development of society, economic forces have become derivatives of the state, which is now the prime mover of history. The role of certain leading personalities is decisive. Society develops through command from above.

This state of affairs has gradually and painfully (vide the Great Purge) been officially endorsed. The party reacted to the new conditions by changing the old ideology to accord with the conditions and to facilitate adaptation to them. Most of the old revolutionary leaders who had supported Stalin, and who perhaps lacked the cynical flexibility required for this maneuver, were liquidated. The aspect of the change which has proved most confusing however is the regime's insistence that the new ideology is the only correct interpretation of Marxism and that all others constitute counter-revolutionary treachery.

The General Pattern of Ideological Change

A. The Situation Before 1929

Until 1929 intellectual life in Soviet Russia enjoyed what is in retrospect a remarkable degree of freedom. Many pre-revolutionary intellectual figures continued their work. The party recognized limitations to its competence in areas outside of politics, although it encouraged Marxist thinkers. "I favor . . . a general leadership and the maximum of competition," declared Bukharin, when he was still in power as the party's main theoretical voice during the New Economic Policy (NEP).[5] Much contact was maintained with the outside world. Soviet arts and sciences were generally abreast of the rest of the world; modernistic developments similar to those

abroad, amid a variety of schools of thought, characterized the Russian scene. Party doctrine, which was dominant though not rigorous in the social sciences, was characterized by thoroughgoing Marxian economic and environmental determinism, and mechanistic views of nature, history, and personality—by ideas not greatly at variance with the intellectual fashion abroad.

In social policy the party continued to affirm the ideals of the revolution, although in practice they were somewhat toned down. Social reform was limited by exaggerated awareness of Russian cultural backwardness and the consolidation of the state and industrial administration on more or less conventionally bureaucratic lines. Particularly in industry practical considerations militated against revolutionary ideals; workers' control of factories was condemned by 1921, and income inequality grew. Notable efforts continued to be made to realize certain revolutionary ideals—progressive education, the equality of women, the anti-religious campaign, and the party "maximum," a ceiling on monetary income for party members.

B. The First Phase of the Change, 1929-32

The basic political context of the transformation in Soviet intellectual life was the emergence of the monolithic state under the dictatorship of Stalin. All opposition in the party was crushed and party doctrine was elevated to the level of an absolute, compulsory, and exclusive creed. On this basis there was undertaken in 1929 an intensive effort to transform Soviet society by a revolution from above, with the aim of accomplishing (a) the incorporation of all aspects of society, particularly the peasantry and intellectual activities under the direct control of the government; (b) the intensive development of the industrial base of state power; (c) the introduction of measures in social policy which accorded with the effective functioning of this emerging totalitarian political order.

The common theme in the intellectual and social policies instituted in accordance with the new objectives of the regime was the establishment of discipline, controls, and the principle of party supremacy in all aspects of life. Partiinost' — "party-ness" or party spirit—and service to the party were imposed on intellectual activity as the supreme criterion of value and truth. Non-party people and nonconforming party members (especially people imbued with the traditional Marxian determinism and mechanistic outlook, who were now identified with the Bukharin opposition) were denounced; their works were suppressed; they were ousted

from their jobs, and frequently arrested as counter-revolutionaries. The party directed this action most typically through its strong men—party members working in the various fields who put power ahead of intellectual integrity and who, invested with the authority of the party, proceeded to suppress all dissenting thought. Such were Pokrovsky in history, Zalkind in psychology, and Averbakh in literature (and more recently, Lysenko in biology). All this action was described as the pursuance of the class war "on the ideological front," "on the historical front," etc. Indeed, Soviet society as a whole was, under this guise of the class war, thoroughly militarized.

The intellectual content of the orthodoxies imposed by the party was not entirely uniform. There was on the one hand extreme, "vulgar" determinist Marxism, which prevailed in history under Pokrovsky, and on the other the Marxism with voluntarist overtones which had roots in Lenin's pre-revolutionary thought and which became the rule in the arts and psychology. In general, however, the period can be described as one in which extreme Marxism, however interpreted, was imposed in the arts and in the social sciences. (Natural science remained relatively free for the time being.) Immediate utility to the party, in justifying its policies, discrediting its enemies, and propagandizing the masses, was the standard to which intellectual activity was made to conform.

C. The Second Phase of the Change, 1932-37

After the system of party control and supremacy in intellectual activity was established, and as crises developed in each field, the party control system was used to compel drastic changes in the substance of ideas and forms. Successively in each field a breakdown in practical work threatened as a result of the imposition of extreme Marxism—in literature and the arts, little or no worth-while work was produced; in history, students failed to learn the chronology of events; in psychology, there was insufficient emphasis on making the most out of the available human material; in law, no one was taking law schools seriously. Equally important, the regime began to become aware that the "proletarian" thought and policies which it was imposing were not the best for its purposes (i.e., for furthering the new de facto goal of state power and stability). As a result of these considerations, the extreme Marxism of the First Five Year Plan period was successively repudiated in various fields, while the people who had espoused and imposed these views in the name of the party

were denounced as anti-Marxist wreckers and in many cases liquidated. The earlier extreme Marxism was then replaced by a surprisingly obvious and thorough traditionalism, which was declared to be the sole true application of Marxist principles. In this fashion, the machinery and justification of control built up during the process of imposing extreme Marxism were retained, but turned around to operate in the opposite direction. Traditionalism, under the label of "Socialist Realism," "Soviet humanism," "dialectical materialism" as opposed to "vulgar economic materialism," or whatnot, was imposed with all the compulsions at the party's command. There was a great practical difference as opposed to the 1929-32 period, however; traditionalism in intellectual life worked, within limits, whereas the extreme Marxism had broken down; traditionalist intellectual activity, under strict controls, satisfied the needs of the regime.

With surprising consistency the same process was undergone by various fields. It occurred in literature and in the arts between 1932 and 1934, with the liquidation of RAPP (the Revolutionary Association of Proletarian Writers) and its analogues, and the instituting of "Socialist Realism." In history, it was accomplished with the restoration of the traditional kings-and-battles presentation and the rehabilitation of the Russian past, in 1934, and the outright repudiation of Pokrovsky as anti-Marxist, in 1936. Law followed, with the downfall of Pashukanis and the repudiation of the theory of the withering away of law in 1936-37. In psychology there was a gradual reaction from environmental conditioning toward emphasis on individual will and responsibility, culminating in 1936. Political theory awaited Stalin's pronunciamentos, the clearest of which came in 1939—the state would not wither away, but was the chief instrument for the building of "communist society" as well as for protection against the capitalist encirclement and against "thieves and plunderers of socialist property."

Parallel developments took place in social policy. Finding inadequate for its needs the sanctions of proletarian enthusiasm supplemented by outright force, the regime turned progressively to the building blocks of the traditional social order: glorification of the state and of legality; encouragement and marked recognition of status differences; income differentiation as an incentive; traditionally authoritarian family and educational policy, in an effort to cultivate the self-driving yet compliant qualities needed by the new bureaucratic industrial order; the rehabilitation of patriotism as a potent source of loyalty to the state; even a de facto concord with religion, as the Church in return for being unmolested undertook to encourage political loyalty to the state.

The pattern of change is striking in its regularity. It suggests the need for a new conception of the real contemporary nature, interests, and motivations of the Soviet state—the kind of state for which the intellectual and social policies adopted in the thirties are most appropriate.

The problem of controls over intellectual activity did not, with the completion of the second stage of the transition, become reduced to the simple negative task of censorship. Much of the "deviation" which continued to occur seems to be due to the lack of a clear definition of the party's positive desires. What the party really wanted was to eradicate the revolutionary tradition and replace it with a conservatism which would make the state and the economy easier to run and would appeal more to the evidently authoritarian proclivities of the Stalinist leadership. This goal could not, of course, be stated explicitly, because the stability of the regime and its support abroad were vitally dependent on maintaining continuity with the revolutionary tradition of the past. Even the leadership was probably not prepared to recognize its real objectives in frank terms. Consequently, the party felt compelled to continue to profess adherence to Marxism; the objectionable features of Marxist thought were eliminated, and pronounced un-Marxist. This, of course, has been extremely confusing to Soviet intellectuals, steeped for years in all aspects of Marxism. They do not realize what is wanted; it cannot be told them directly; and they are unlikely to come to an understanding of it on their own because the regime is to them axiomatically the pure embodiment of Marxism. They are simply unable to distinguish between the goals of the regime and the Marxist and revolutionary tradition which the regime is trying to bury. As a result of this situation, official condemnations of their work come as bolts from the blue, completely incomprehensible; the intellectuals can only try to learn by trial and error—perhaps one should say, error and trial—what work will be condemned and what will be approved. This explains the long series of crackdowns on intellectuals, which taken by themselves make no sense and appear to lack any clear direction.

Literature and the Arts

As in other intellectual fields, a wide degree of latitude for literary work prevailed in the nineteen-twenties. Although direct party control of literature was advocated by some extremist literary groups, the official sanction of the party was not accorded to any one school. The position of the moderate Marxist critic Voronsky that "no literary current, school, or group must come

forward in the name of the party,"[6] was endorsed by Lenin, Trotsky, and Bukharin.

In 1929 commenced the party's effort to mobilize all intellectual activities for its own purposes. In literature this was accomplished simply by giving a free hand to the Averbakh group of extreme Marxists, who, organized in the RAPP (the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers), proceeded with the authority of the party to impose on all writers rigid utilitarian standards of propagandistic proletarian writing. Both those who resisted in the name of artistic freedom, and the Pereverzev group, who contended on Marxist grounds that only proletarians could write pro letarian literature, were condemned and removed from posts they held. The attack on the Pereverzev group for "vulgar economic determinism"[7] illustrates the application of the new voluntarist philosophy with its emphasis on subjective factors, such as the enthusiasm of individuals, which could yield victory over "objective conditions." The spirit of the campaign for partiinost' and against any nonconformity or notion of art for art's sake, was demonstrated by the literary leader Kirshon at the Sixteenth Party Congress in 1930: ". . . we must pass over to a decisive offensive, mercilessly liquidating bourgeois ideology. . . . The class enemy on the literary front is becoming active. At a time of sharpened class struggle any liberalism, any respect for aesthetic language, even though it may be directed against us, is direct aid to the class enemy . . . . The whole purpose of our activity and our work lies in the fight for the building of Socialism. . . ."[8] Even the celebrated proletarian poet Mayakovsky was attacked—this apparently contributed to his suicide in April, 1930.

The intensity with which literature was politicalized under the RAPP regime led to an early crisis; literature was consequently the field in which the second phase of intellectual change, the enforced restoration of traditional content rationalized as Marxism, began. Under RAPP, literature was simply no good. In 1932, the party leadership became aware of this situation, abolished RAPP, and made its leaders scapegoats for the disastrous policy carried out by them in the name of the party. Both Averbakh and Kirshon, among others, became victims of the Great Purge. This was the characteristic fashion in which the extreme "proletarian" policies of 1929-32 were repudiated as anti-Marxist; the infallibility of the party was preserved.[9]

The new official line for literature, "Socialist Realism" (soon extended to the other arts), had little definite meaning at first. Only through various artists' attempts at conformity and criticism

of them for failings therin did the desires of the regime become evident. By 1936, roughly, Socialist Realism had acquired a definite meaning—a quite rigidly traditional conservatism! Every serious student of the arts in Soviet Russia has acknowledged the overwhelming fact that the revolutionary tradition in cultural fields has been completely repudiated. One observer was in spite of his political sympathy upset by this: "It is a fact that new revolutionary political ideas are faced with reactionary stylistic principles in art. The same government that is courageously piloting the ship of state through the uncharted seas of socialistic practice is enjoining its artists to stay behind in safe haven. We must try to elucidate the reasons for this paradoxical development."[10]

The patterns of change in the other fields of artistic work were virtually identical with that in literature. All went through the period of proletarian propaganda beginning in 1929; all experienced a more or less abrupt change from revolutionary content to the traditionalism of Socialist Realism—music in 1932-33; architecture around 1935; the theater in 1932; films beginning in 1932; even the ballet conformed with precision to the party line.[11]

Socialist Realism is characterized by impassioned nationalism (corresponding to the revival of nationalist propaganda and historiography), by reverence for the classics (corresponding to the rehabilitation of the Russian past), by an emotional rather than analytic approach, and by a catering to the public taste. Any deviation is attacked as "formalism": "Socialist Realism . . . was also a reaction against what was described, sweepingly and therefore meaninglessly, as 'bourgeois Formalism.' This phrase was used to include all experiments with form and technique, and much of earlier Soviet literature came under this description. . . . Those who were responsible for running the most 'advanced' state in the world suddenly turned conservative and began to look askance at all revolutionary experiments in art, dubbing them as 'bourgeois Formalism.'"[12] Under the terms of Socialist Realism and formalism, good and evil became embodied in sharply differentiated opposing concepts, with no sense of a continuum of values or a middle ground between them. This structuration of judgment is typical of Soviet thought since the transformation of the thirties. It is analogous, moreover, to the patterns of thought ascribed by some psychologists to the so-called "authoritarian" personality.[13] Such types, this and other evidence suggests, have come to predominate more and more in the Soviet regime since the consolidation of power by Stalin.

Such positive philosophy as Socialist Realism has, was given

its initial statement by Maxim Gorky—an optimistic individualism idealizing the "new Soviet Man." [14] A more recent formulation called for "monumental works wherein the man of our age, the man of the Stalin type, the creator of the Plans, will be revealed in his full stature; works in which will be shown how was forged the will-power of that man, how his soul was formed and how his consciousness was strengthened, enriched, and armed by the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." [15] The parallelism of the new conception of personality in literature with that in psychology and in history is complete.

It is evident that this individualism under the conditions of a totalitarian state is largely of and for the leaders, who patently do "make history." For the masses, it seems, Socialist Realism in the arts is designed to reconcile people to the regime, to satisfy vicariously their aspirations for power and control over their own fates, and to stimulate eager participation in the projects undertaken by the regime. For the arts no new development is possible, but since the style to which they are constrained has been an artistically meaningful one with much vitality in its history, artistic production does manage to go on.

In the post-war years, in literature as in other fields, the party's main concern seems to have been the restoration of controls and the reassertion of the principle of party supremacy. In content the pre-war traditionalism and nationalism of Socialist Realism have only been strengthened. In a few cases, as in the celebrated affair of Zoshchenko and Akhmatove in 1946, attacks were made which were reminiscent of 1929-30. These were directed against writings which lacked "party spirit," which contributed nothing to the ideological insulation of the Soviet peoples against Western or bourgeois influences, or which in fact expressed philosophical pessimism which might threaten to undermine the compulsory optimism of Soviet "humanism."

History

The imposition of "party spirit" and the enforcement of Marxist orthodoxy occurred suddenly and violently in the field of the writing and teaching of history. M. N. Pokrovsky, a professional historian but also a long-standing member of the party, head of the Communist Academy and the Institute of Red Professors and a member of the Central Control Commission of the party, set up a virtual dictatorship in history, terminating the fairly broad tolerance which had been accorded the activities of non-party historians during the NEP. Between 1929 and 1931 non-Marxist historical

science was eradicated; all important positions were filled with newly trained party men.[16]

The kind of historical thought which Pokrovsky imposed in the name of the party was distinguished by absolute economic determinism, an extremely anti-nationalist attitude toward the Russian past, and a highly abstract treatment of history in a rigid framework of class struggle and social and economic forces; the individual was merely the agent of these impersonal forces. Of the facts, particularly as worked up by bourgeois historians, Pokrovsky was frankly disdainful.

This attitude, as well as Pokrovsky's uncompromising hostility toward all dissenting trends of historical thought, stemmed from the doctrine of partiinost', which was developed by Pokrovsky to its most extreme implications. "History is present-day politics turned to the past" —simply a weapon in the class struggle. There is no such thing as objectivity, all science being merely class science, so the scientist cannot fail to take sides.

In accordance with the principle of partiinost', Pokrovsky revised his own presentation of Russian history. Previously he had argued that Russia had not been behind Europe in development; thus he could show the October Revolution as a natural development, and refute Trotsky. After 1929, it became desirable to emphasize the backwardness in the Russian past, to contrast it with the progress being made under Socialism, and to stress the importance of the subjective factors of mass will and enthusiasm.[17] Voluntarist Marxism superseded determinist Marxism.

After the purge of bourgeois historians was completed, partiinost' was vigorously applied to the Marxist historians themselves; waves of criticism and reorganization secured the establishment and enforcement of party doctrine as the basic truth for historical science. Stalin himself set the tone for this campaign, denouncing as "rotten liberalism" any failure to accept party principles as "axioms."[18]

Shortly after the change of course in literature and the arts, it became evident that the regime in history which Povrovsky left at his death in 1932 was not compatible with the changing conceptions and new requirements of the party leadership. Action to correct the situation was taken through a decree of the Central Committee of the party and the Council of People's Commissars: ". . . the teaching of history in schools of the USSR is unsatisfactory. The textbooks and oral instruction are of an abstract schematic character. Instead of the teaching of civic history in an animated and entertaining form with an exposition of the most im-

portant events and facts in their chronological sequence and with sketches of historical personages, the pupils are given abstract definitions of social and economic formations, which thus replace the consecutive exposition of history by abstract sociological schemes."[19] This statement of common sense betrays complete indifference to the Marxian conception of history and Marxian notions of what is important in history. The party leaders simply perceived that the teaching of history was deficient in certain practical results, and they decreed direct action to correct the deficiency. Reference to Marxist doctrine came afterwards, to justify the practical measures which had been decided on. This case illustrates well the changed relation between ideology and policy which was becoming established by this time; ideology ceased to pose the goals for policy, and served only as a means for rationalization after the fact.

The new (i.e., conventional) type of history which was called for accorded with the decision of the regime to utilize the forces of nationalism and to rehabilitate the Russian past. The cultivation of national pride, in turn, required increased efforts to discredit Pokrovsky's anti-nationalist influence. Marxism continued of course to be verbally adhered to; the party called for new history texts which would embody its criticisms and hence provide "correct analysis and correct explanation of historical events leading to the Marxist conception of history. . . ."[20] However, the positive wishes of the party were insufficiently clear, and no satisfactory texts were produced.

In January, 1936, the party leadership acted to clarify its views, through a sweeping decision of the Central Committee of the party and the Council of People's Commissars which reviewed the difficulties of Soviet historiography during the preceding few years and attributed them all to the insidious influence of the Pokrovsky school of historians.[21] Like RAPP in literature, Pokrovsky's ghost was made the scapegoat for the nonsensical extremes and the pedagogical failures of the party's past policy in history. Marxism was in effect abandoned, because it had become inexpedient for an authoritarian state to uphold the spirit of the old doctrine, but this transformation in basic theory was camouflaged by representing the attack on Pokrovsky as a defense of the true Marxist faith against those who had been trying to pervert it.

"Vulgar economic materialism" was the term used to describe Pokrovsky's alleged deviation from the Marxist conception of history. (This phrase revealed what the men in control of the

party now thought of the doctrine on which they had been brought up.) The subjectivism of Pokrovsky's extreme partiinost', his position that the historical record could and should be shaped according to the interests of the party, was likewise repudiated. Drawing their ideas from the "dialectical" philosophers who received the sanction of the party in 1930, Pokrovsky's critics reaffirmed scientific objectivity—of a sort: "Every theory in a class society has a class bias, and serves as a weapon for one class or another. But from this it follows that not every theory is false, subjective. Today only Marxism defends absolute truth, i.e., fundamental science."[20] In subsequent practice, "objectivity" was reduced, like so many categories of thought in Russia's neo-pseudo-Marxism, to a mere expression of alleged good—a label.

The new task for the historians was stated bluntly: "The historical scheme of Comrade Stalin and the problems posed by it must be worked out in the concrete historical material and made the property of the broadest masses of the toilers."[23] In spite of the pressure which it applied, however, the party had great difficulty in keeping the work of Soviet historians free of the perverse influences of the Pokrovsky school. The textbook competition of 1936-37 yielded such unsatisfactory results that no first prize was awarded—only a "second prize" went to the work by Shestakov, which nevertheless stands as a milestone in the transition to traditionally narrative, political, and nationalistic history.[24]

The outlines of the new Soviet historiography emerged gradually in the course of the party's campaign to root out the influence of Pokrovsky and his followers. Under the cover of the Marxian terminology, which was retained, the substance of Marxist historical thought was almost completely dispensed with. Most striking was the new emphasis on the role of the individual in history; particularly, of the great men who by their exceptional understanding of the laws of history provide the proletariat with the far-sighted leadership essential for its victory—i.e., Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. Though material conditions are at least formally taken into account, the main emphasis has shifted to subjective factors—consciousness, will, ideology, leadership, and organization. Objective conditions are treated passively; the understanding, critical in Marxism, of the internal dynamics of socio-economic conditions and systems in the mass seems to have been lost or rejected entirely. What kind of Marxism is it, after all, which can conceive of economic and social forces pushing the proletariat to the brink of power and then ceasing to operate? Stalin disposed of Marxian sociology as early as 1934, in emphasizing the critical

importance of the Soviet state and the party organization: ". . . precisely because their strength and prestige have grown to an unprecedented degree, it is their work that now determines everything, or nearly everything. There can be no justification for references to so-called objective conditions. Now that the correctness of the party's political line has been confirmed by the experience of a number of years, and that there is no longer any doubt as to the readiness of the workers and peasants to support this line, the part played by so-called objective conditions has been reduced to a minimum; whereas the part played by our organizations and their leaders has become decisive, exceptional. What does this mean? It means that from now on nine-tenths of the responsibility for the failures and defects in our work rests, not on 'objective' conditions, but on ourselves alone."[25]

Law

Nowhere was the doctrinaire determinism of traditional Marxism carried to such extreme defiance of reality as in the field of legal theory. According to the view of Pashukanis, who dominated Soviet jurisprudence through the thirties until his fall in 1937, law was exclusively a phenomenon of the bourgeois social order. Like the state power, it was to be used by the proletariat as a temporary measure in the struggle against vestiges of the old order, and then it would wither away. The most remarkable thing about this theory was that it was seriously applied: civil law was neglected and law schools threatened to wither from lack of interest.[26] The concepts of guilt and punishment were rejected as implying an un-Marxian notion of individual responsibility.[27]

In keeping with the shift from determinism to voluntarism in the First Five Year Plan period the dynamic conception of plan was formulated with which to contrast law. Pashukanis had to adapt to the new subjectivism in this respect and also in recognizing the increased emphasis on the role of the state in building socialism.[28]

In 1936, the entire revolutionary conception of law was suddenly repudiated, with the introduction of the new constitution and Stalin's demand for "stability of laws." The notion of the withering away of law was denounced as wrecking, and Pashukanis, vainly recanting, was disgraced early in 1937. His place at the head of the Soviet legal profession was taken by his erstwhile assistant Vyshinsky. The meaning of "revolutionary legality" was changed from the subordination of law to political expediency, to strict

observance of the law (except where political opposition to the regime might be involved). Conventional law codes and pre-revolutionary law professors were restored to their places.[29] "Crime," "punishment," and the concept of individual guilt were restored. The standards for determining the responsibility of psychopaths and minors were drastically lowered.[30]

Though the Soviet leadership was still interested in revolutionary change, it encouraged the curtailment of law as an obstacle to policy and to the establishment of the supreme authority of the party. When stability became the prime concern of the leadership, law in its most traditionalist forms (though under the "socialist" label) was restored to buttress the authority of the state and help enforce a sense of individual responsibility upon the population. As will be seen, there are in this regard close correspondences of law with political theory, psychology, family policy, and education.

Political Theory

Changes in the field of political theory provide a further dramatic illustration of the transformation in the official Soviet mentality, in close association with the shift in law. From the original view of the proletarian state as a necessary evil destined to wither away after the revolutionary social transformation was accomplished, party doctrine has shifted around 180 degrees, to extoll the state as the highest form of social organization and a great creative force.[31]

Until 1929, the Marxian theory was still in force more or less in its original form; the Soviet one-party state was described as the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, required during the transition period to suppress the resistance of the former property-owning classes. It still was, like the legal system, supposed to wither away once this essentially negative task had been accomplished and the realization of socialism completed.

Two potentially significant innovations in political theory were introduced by Stalin during his rise to power in the 1920's—both, to be sure, as rationalizations after the fact. One of Stalin's contributions was the familiar doctrine of "Socialism in One Country" —the assertion, Marx and Engels to the contrary, that the revolution did not have to be international but could prosper in isolation, even in Russia. This thesis, once its acceptance became obligatory, set the stage for obvious later arguments on the necessity of the state, even under "communism," for national defense. Stalin's

other idea was an extension of the familiar Leninist doctrine of the inspirational and guiding role of the party, applying it not only to the preparation and execution of the revolution, but to the organization of the post-revolutionary socialist order: ". . . the proletariat needs the Party not only to achieve the dictatorship; it needs it still more to maintain the dictatorship, to consolidate and expand it in order to achieve the complete victory of Socialism."[32] For Stalin, even at this early date, it was not underlying economic development which should be relied upon to provide the "conditions for the inauguration of socialist production,"[33] but rather the deliberate action of a political institution, the party.

As vigorous and often violent political action by the state to transform the country was launched in the form of the First Five Year Plan and the collectivization of agriculture, and as social and intellectual life were subjected to all-embracing party and state controls, Stalin began to give the positive functions of the Soviet state a more explicit and somewhat less transitory place in the corpus of Marxian doctrine. Perhaps the irony of his "dialectical" twist escaped him when he explained his position to the Sixteenth Party Congress in June, 1930: "We are in favor of the state dying out, and at the same time we stand for the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which represents the most powerful and mighty authority of all forms of state which have existed up to the present day. The highest possible development of the power of the state, with the object of preparing the conditions for the dying out of the state: this is the Marxist formula. Is it 'contradictory'? Yes, it is 'contradictory.' But this contradiction is a living thing, and completely reflects Marxist dialectics."[34] By 1934 Stalin had arrived at a definite rationale for this "strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat": "It goes without saying that a classless society cannot come of itself, spontaneously, as it were. It has to be achieved and built by the efforts of all the working people, by strengthening the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by intensifying the class struggle, by abolishing classes, by eliminating the remnants of the capitalist classes, and in battles with enemies both internal and external."[35] This remark illustrates graphically how the political efforts which Stalin was undertaking led him toward a thorough revision of the Marxian theory of the state and the role of political factors in history, asserting their transcendence over "objective conditions." It is not mere coincidence that kings-and-battles history was rehabilitated at the expense of Pokrovsky's sociologism in the same year.

With the promulgation of the Stalin Constitution in 1936 the class struggle was officially declared to be at an end.[36] Nevertheless, no grounds were to be found for diminishing the rigors of the dictatorship of the proletariat—apparently in complete disregard of the most elementary Marxian notions about the responsibility of class antagonisms for social conflict. Since the onset of the purge period of 1936-1938 it has, in fact, been customary to describe and explain political opposition in moral more than in social terms—"dregs of humanity," "Whiteguard insects," "traitorous hirelings of foreign intelligence services," "Trotsky-Bukharin fiends"—rotten apples, in short, corrupted by something approaching original sin.[37] This change of attitude is quite in keeping with the shift from sociological explanations to emphasis on individual will and responsibility in history and in criminal law. Moreover, Soviet demonology closely fits the pattern of the "authoritarian personality."

The need for a further revision of the official theory of the state to bring doctrine into accord with the obvious permanence of the Soviet state machinery was faced by Stalin in 1939, in his speech to the Eighteenth Party Congress. The novelty of his thoughts was hailed as "raising the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the state to a new, higher level." This standard Soviet acclaim was an understatement: Stalin departed altogether from his Marxist heritage by making the state a decisive force in the historical process. The new social order was declared to have been realized through "the work of economic organization and cultural education performed by our state bodies with the purpose of developing the infant shoots of the new, Socialist economic system and re-educating the people in the spirit of Socialism."[38] The necessity of continuing to rely on police repression also received its recognition, though the social roots of the trouble were, as was characteristic for the new political outlook, left unmentioned: "In place of this function of suppression the state acquired the function of protecting socialist property from thieves and pilferers of the people's property."[39] Above all must the state carry out the responsibilities of national defense. Would the state "wither away" once the stage of "communism" were attained? Marx and Engels to the contrary, it would not, if the "capitalist encirclement" continued. "Engels' general formula about the destiny of the Socialist state in general cannot be extended to the partial and specific case of the victory of Socialism in one country only," Stalin explained.[40] On occasions such as this Stalin found it opportune to make direct criticism of inadequacies in the thinking of his masters—particularly where his

theory of socialism in one country was involved. Back in 1926, in reply to criticism of his theory by the Trotsky opposition, Stalin maintained, "Engels . . . would welcome our revolution, and say: To hell with all old formulas! Long live the victorious revolution in the Soviet Union."[41]

Stalin's point was obvious in 1939 when the original internationalist axioms of Marx and Engels had been forgotten: the continued existence of the capitalist encirclement would necessitate the retention of the state even after the ultimate phase of "communism" would be attained. One might observe that the real logic of this rationalization was the reverse—that the continued existence of the state would necessitate the retention of the capitalist encirclement. Here, perhaps, is a key to the ideological function of international hostility for Soviet Russia since the Second World War.

Education

Before 1931 there was, as elsewhere, much diversity in Soviet educational thought. Educational practice however was dominated by a single problem—the lack of resources for meeting the vast unsatisfied educational needs of the country. Universal compulsory primary education was not achieved until around 1937.[42] Education was nevertheless recognized by Lenin as an important weapon of the proletarian dictatorship in extending the influence of the working class and in preparing the population, particularly the backward peasantry, for Socialism.[43] This political aspect Soviet education has manifested ever since, whatever the changes in the direction of the political line.

Lenin, though he made reference to the goal of "self-activity of children in the school,"[44] was relatively conservative in comparison with many Soviet educational specialists. Lunacharsky, the Commissar of Education until 1929, was a promoter of the progressive education methods then becoming popular in the West.[45] The head of the Marx-Engels Institute for Pedagogy, V. N. Shulgin, was the chief exponent of the theory of "unorganized" or "spontaneous" education, according to which organized education was only a temporary measure to be supplanted by the "socialist environment" as the school withered away along with the state.[46] This doctrine was closely related to the mechanistic and determinist philosophy of Marxism which prevailed until 1929-30. It was, however, opposed by many Soviet educational leaders, including Lenin's wife Krupskaya, as too anarchistic.[47] Prevalent in Soviet

education in this period were the basic assumptions of the innate goodness of man and the spontaneous development of personality. "Learning by doing" was the ideal method; formal instruction and discipline were to be held to a minimum.[48]

Under the impact of the First Five Year Plan and the rejection of the mechanistic philosophy, drastic change was bound to occur. An alternative educational doctrine had already been formulated, positing the state as a "purposive organization" which deliberately utilized organized education to manipulate the unorganized educational influences and eventually supplant them.[49] Proceeding from the standpoint of practical results in education to meet the immediate needs of economic development, the party leadership took action in the fall of 1931. In a series of decrees, it attacked "left opportunists" for the doctrine of the withering away of the school, and abolished Shulgin's Pedagogical Institute; it criticized progressive methods; it re-established the separate teaching of traditional subjects and emphasized them at the expense of craft and technical training; and it restored old-fashioned discipline and grading.[50] The earlier educational theory was rejected on the same grounds as the mechanistic philosophy, for running counter to the regime's demand for a great organized and purposeful effort to transform the nation.

The new attitude of the regime in education was closely related to the officially encouraged changes in Soviet psychology, where again in the years 1930-31 the mechanistic and deterministic orientation was being replaced with a more purposive, voluntaristic and less biological approach.[51] Together with the theory of consciousness and will went the restoration of authority in educational practice. Organization and authority were relied on by the state to accomplish its purposes now in spite of the material conditions of society—as Stalin himself had emphasized. Practical results in the inculcation of knowledge, as well as in the molding of personalities both more self-disciplined and more amenable to disciplinary forces from outside, became the norm for the educational process in the USSR.

The trend to conventional formalities and discipline continued during 1932-34, especially with its extension to higher education: the ideas of the "leftist deviation" continued to be attacked.[52] Two major steps completed the transition from organized and conscious but revolutionary and proletarian education, to traditional education. The first was the decree of July, 1936, abolishing the science of "Pedalogy" (developmental child psychology) because it stressed "fatalistic conditioning" by hereditary and environmental

factors and neglected the allegedly vast potentialities of education in directly molding personalities.[53] The final step was taken in 1937 with the abolition of polytechnical training in the schools and the return of the entire formal educational effort to traditional subjects.[54] This change in educational policy reflected the growing acceptance of the increasing social differentiation between the intelligentsia and the masses, and marked the abandonment in practice of an ideal still verbally adhered to, the elimination of the distinction between mental and manual labor.

The Soviet educational system which finally took shape around 1936 or 1937 has evidently in its fundamentals satisfied the needs of the regime. It has remained fairly stable ever since, with only minor tightening up and shifts in emphasis. The political aspects of education were re-emphasized after 1945 as "a weapon for the communist transformation of society," and vigorous attacks have been made on ideological weaknesses and "formalism" (here as elsewhere a vague term for unsatisfactory results).[55] The stern, disciplinary nature of the new Soviet educational theory, stressing the ideal pattern on which the state is consciously striving to mold its citizens, has been highlighted by recent criticism of the educational measures of 1918 for "serious errors" including "the idealization of the nature of the child."[56]

Policy Regarding Social Mores

At the revolution the family as an institution fell within the sweep of the Bolsheviks' hostility to what they considered the authoritarian legacy of the past. Among the early acts of the regime were the secularization of marriage, affirmation of the complete equality of women, curtailment of parental authority, legalization of abortion, and the granting of divorces automatically at the request of one party. There was much explicit advocacy of free love (exemplified by Alexandra Kollontai), although Lenin was critical of this. In general, the family was expected to "wither away" except as an entirely informal association. In conformance with this theory the legal code of 1927 made de facto or non-registered marriages legally equal to registered ones.

The attack on traditional family ties was intensified during the First Five Year Plan. Compulsory labor assignments sometimes split families, with no redress. Buildings were even designed for completely communal living.[57] Revolutionary repudiation of the bourgeois amenities resulted in a form of Communist asceticism, which made virtues out of unkemptness and abstention

from social pleasures.[58]

A change in official social values occurred very suddenly in 1935 and 1936, as the regime shifted from one extreme to the other.[59] The immediately precipitating cause of this shift was probably the social disruption attributed to the previous policy—particularly a declining birthrate, high divorce rate, and serious juvenile delinquency. Thus, there seems to be a parallel with policy toward certain intellectual pursuits such as literature and history, and also toward law, where the intensive application of extreme revolutionary notions was resulting in serious damage to the practical aspects of the activities concerned. Although the social instability which the Soviet population was manifesting was undoubtedly due primarily to the disruptive influence of the intensive industrialization and the collectivization, the regime used such social problems as the excuse for a basic repudiation, explicitly and as a matter of principle, of the earlier libertarian family policy. The family began to be extolled as a pillar of socialist society! "So-called 'free love' and all disorderly sex life are bourgeois through and through. . . ."[60] The Victorian attitude toward female chastity was affirmed. A decisive step was the law of June 27, 1936, which prohibited non-therapeutic abortions, made divorce possible only through legal procedure and with the payment of a fee, and established special allowances for large families. These changes were accompanied by a burst of official commentary justifying the new policies and denouncing earlier ideas about the informality of family relationships: "Assertions that socialism brings the withering away of the family are profoundly erroneous and harmful. They play into the hands of bearers of the survivals of capitalism in people's consciousness, who are trying to conceal their exploitative behavior with empty-sounding 'leftist phrases.' The family under socialism does not wither away, but is strengthened. Comrade Stalin, the party, and the government are giving much attention to questions of strengthening the Soviet family."[61] The parallel between this statement and the concurrently developing doctrine on the nature of the socialist state is striking. In both cases the interest of the regime was in justifying the retention or restoration of institutions of authority. Trotsky's comment from exile illustrates the reaction of the unreconstructed revolutionary: "Instead of openly saying, 'We have proven still too poor and ignorant for the creation of socialist relations among men, our children and grandchildren will realize this aim,' the the leaders are forcing people to glue together again the shell of the broken family, and not only that,

but to consider it, under threat of extreme penalties, the sacred nucleus of triumphant socialism. It is hard to measure with the eye the scope of this retreat."[62]

Soviet policy quickly moved to a positive affirmation of a hyper-traditional conception of the family: "The State cannot exist without the family. Marriage is a positive value for the Socialist Soviet State only if the partners see in it a lifelong union. So-called free love is a bourgeois invention and has nothing in common with the principles of conduct of a Soviet citizen. Moreover, marriage receives its full value for the State only if there is progeny, and the consorts experience the highest happiness of parenthood."[63] Also reversed was the attitude toward parental authority: "Young people should respect their elders, especially their parents," declared Komsomolskaia Pravda.[64]

The change in family policy was accompanied by a sweeping alteration in the officially approved standards for social conduct. All of the ordinary bourgeois amusements, even dancing and fashionable dress, returned, to the evident gratification of the population.[65] This development was probably closely tied to the increasing social stratification which the repudiation of equalitarianism in 1930 facilitated, and the emergent material desires among the newly privileged bureaucratic strata.

The trend away from the revolutionary conception of the family continued during World War II. Curtailment of the freedom of children and the strengthening of parental authority continued. Children under sixteen were excluded from evening theater performances in 1934, and the inheritance law of March, 1945, gave more freedom in the disposition of estates.[66] Co-education in secondary schools was abolished in 1943, allegedly to facilitate military training for boys and domestic training for girls.[67] However, this issue has been raised again more recently and evidently is not yet settled as a matter of principle.

A far-reaching step, second only to the law of June 27, 1936, was the decree of July 8, 1944. With this measure, the retrogression of the Soviet regime in family policy clearly put the USSR behind most countries of the West, and near a par with the Fascist regimes. Divorce was made subject to a rigorous judicial procedure and high fees. Unregistered or de facto marriages ceased to be recognized as legal. Paternity suits and the right of illegitimate children to inheritance from the father were discontinued; a state subsidy was instituted instead of this. In the words of one observer, "There is still no legal stigma of illegitimacy, but the likelihood of effective social stigmatization is increased by the

fact that the child now takes the name of the mother."[68] Most striking in its implications was the provision that instituted titles and medals for motherhood, capped by the award "Heroine Mother" for the bearers of ten children or more. On the material side, incentives were provided by the law in the form of extended child subsidies to families with three children or more, and a special tax on smaller families and single persons.

The changes in Soviet family policy are among the most difficult to account for. Interpretations range widely. One extreme is represented by Timasheff's view that the regime merely sacrificed a peripheral element of the revolution which was felt by most people to be "one of the most unpleasant, almost intolerable aspects of the Communist Experiment. . . . Obviously, this was one of the concessions which the government could grant wholeheartedly, since actually it conceded nothing and gained very much."[69] The other extreme is represented by Trotsky's thesis of the Thermidorean betrayal of revolutionary humanism. An intermediate position is taken by Rudolph Schlesinger, who sees the change as the natural result of the post-revolutionary stabilization, and by Alex Inkeles who believes that "the development of Soviet policy on the family constitutes a striking affirmation of the importance of that institution as a central element in the effective functioning of the type of social system which is broadly characteristic of Western civilization."[70] Left unaccounted for, however, is the manner in which the regime made a virtue of necessity; instead of a hands-off attitude, it began actively driving in the opposite direction, though characteristically still in the name of "socialism." It seems that the Soviet government became interested not simply in the stabilization of social relationships but in encouraging a family of a certain type, to serve as an instrument to further the interests of a particular kind of state. The state evidently acquired a positive interest in cultivating authoritarian family relationships and personality patterns and traditional compulsive mores, in the belief that these strengthen the authoritarian state structure, and also because such social arrangements were more in accord with the authoritarian inclinations of the dominant political personalities.

It may be that this hypothesis is valid for other elements in the series of changes in Soviet social policy. There has perhaps been, among the various treatments of the subject, excessive emphasis on how the Soviet regime had to adjust to the fundamental needs of the human being and basic cultural factors. The variations of possible solutions may have been underestimated.

Depending on a certain goal of state policy or an ideal of social organization or a preference on the part of a political leader, a particular type of family relationship might seem most satisfactory. The nature of the choices actually made by the Soviet leadership, and the fervor with which they were enjoined upon the population, are important indicators in clarifying the essentially authoritarian character of the present Soviet regime.

Religion

Regarding religion, Soviet policy changed neither so soon nor so much as in other fields. The substance of the original revolutionary attitude toward religion as an evil is still asserted. The regime has not declared that religion is good and in accordance with Marxism, as would follow by analogy with its shifting attitude, for example, on the all-powerful state. In practice, however, the regime has made a definite shift toward conciliation with the Church.

Active suppression of religious activities, in varying intensity, continued from the revolution through the period of the collectivization and the First Five Year Plan, though with some of the characteristic relaxation of the NEP from 1923 to 1929. Anti-religious propaganda was intensified under the direction of the Society of Militant Atheists during the period of the imposition of extreme Marxist doctrine, in 1929-32. After 1934 and particularly after 1936, there was a notable relaxation, and in particular certain symbolic concessions, such as curtailment of anti-religious demonstrations, and the restoration of Sunday as the day of rest, as well as the removal of civil disabilities from the clergy by the Constitution of 1936.[71]

A measure of the impact of the revolution on religion, as well as of the resiliency of the latter, was provided by the official estimate of 1937, which indicated that half the population were still believers. The traditionalist trend of Soviet policy asserted itself firmly, as the regime, more or less accepting this state of affairs, came to realize more clearly its basic interest in seeking the cooperation of the Orthodox Church as an instrument for strengthening popular loyalty to the state and improving the sense of discipline among the people.

Spectacular developments occurred during World War II. In 1941 the Orthodox leadership declared its firm support of the war effort, and anti-religious activity by the regime was completely suspended. The rapprochement was capped in 1943 as the regime permitted the restoration of the Patriarchate, with its own journal.

Soon afterward, monasteries and the Orthodox Theological Institute were reopened. Governmental supervision over the Church has been maintained however through the Council for Russian Orthodox Affairs.[72] To a certain extent, state-church relations correspond to the formula of the cultivation or toleration of traditionalist attitudes but with the maintenance of strict controls.

On the other hand, the party retains its official anti-religious policy. It now takes the stand that anti-religious propaganda and education are necessary to prepare for the transition to communism, but that no coercion or violence should be allowed. The party seems content to hold its own and maintain ideological discipline among its own membership.

Social Stratification

The ideal of equalitarianism was firmly rooted in the revolutionary tradition, both Western and Russian, although Marx and Engels had cautioned that this goal could not be attained immediately and that the abolition of private property in the means of production was a fundamental prerequisite. Lenin in his State and Revolution of 1917 subscribed fully to Marx's dictum on keeping officials' salaries to the level of workers' wages, and emphasized a program for the masses to take over administrative functions and eliminate the need for bureaucrats standing above the populace.[73]

Soon after the Bolsheviks came to power, the party leadership became aware of the need for trained administrative experts, in the government, in industry, and in the army. Accordingly, over the protests of the idealist left-wing opposition in the party, they began to resort to "bourgeois specialists" (spetsy), including former tsarist officers and officials, who were well paid in accordance with their skills. In administrative methods, the leadership found the anarcho-syndicalist notions current among the party and its proletarian supporters in 1917-18 to be a grave weakness, and progressively re-instituted the conventional bureaucratic system of individual authority. More from necessity than from design, a nearly complete equalitarianism (with the exception of the spetsy) was reached by 1920, as inflation and shortages reduced the urban population to a common level of rationed consumption. The range of real factory wages from lowest to highest was virtually negligible.[74]

During the NEP, the bureaucratic aspect of Soviet economic life was somewhat curtailed, as party and trade union representatives shared in industrial management. Wage differentiation

as an incentive however grew and reached capitalistic proportions by 1928. In the party and in political life, developments took the opposite direction: the system of bureaucratic authority was greatly developed, while the personal income of party members was strictly limited by the "party maximum." [75] The ideal of equality was still an effective restraint on further income differentiation.

With the onset of intensive industrialization and the universal assertion of the primacy of the needs of the state, the equalitarian ideal was frankly discarded. The trade union leadership was purged and replaced with firm supporters of the view that the unions should represent primarily the interests of the state rather than those of the workers. At the beginning of the First Five Year Plan, the regime relied heavily on propaganda and the new wave of apparently genuine revolutionary enthusiasm for the "building of socialism," which characterized the first years of the First Five Year Plan, to provide the necessary incentive for the intense effort which the state required. Monetary incentives however were rapidly extended to replace flagging enthusiasm; in 1931 Stalin sounded the new keynote, as he criticized "the 'Leftist' practice of wage equalization" and emphasized the necessity for monetary incentives to cultivate skills and improve productivity. "Whoever," he declared to a meeting of industrial administrators, "draws up wage scales on the 'principle' of wage equalization, without taking into account the difference between skilled labor and unskilled labor, breaks with Marxism, breaks with Leninism." [76] Such was the new theme, soon to become familiar—denouncing former revolutionary notions as "petty-bourgeois" and "anti-Marxist," and hailing the newly re-discovered principles of the traditional social order as the eternal Marxian verity. Particularly significant in the evolution of the party from a political movement to an association of the socially privileged was the relaxation of the party maximum in 1929 and its subsequent unannounced lapse. [77]

By 1934, a virtue was made of necessity. The embarrassment of Marxian equalitarianism was disposed of by redefinition. "Every Leninist knows," said Stalin, "(that is, if he is a real Leninist) that equality in the sphere of requirements and individual life is a piece of reactionary petty-bourgeois absurdity worthy of a primitive sect of ascetics, but not of a Socialist society organized on Marxian lines." The slogan, "to each according to his needs," appears now to require inequality, because people's needs are different; no doubt those of the ordinary worker and the high official

diverge widely. With his slogan "cadres decide everything," Stalin directed the emphasis of the government to well-trained and well-rewarded administrators.[78] Wage differentials and incentives were extended and enshrouded with a mystical halo by the Stakhanovite movement, which was begun in 1935. De-rationing and official sanction for the material amenities of life, commenced in 1934-35, lent added force to income differentiation as an incentive for maximum effort and efficiency.

During the same period, status differences and bureaucratic authority were also on the increase. Individual management with broad powers but heavy responsibility became the rule in industry. The distinctive feature of the new trend was the institution of the overt trappings of authority (the authority itself already well established), often reminiscent of pre-revolutionary Russia.

Developments in the army were particularly noteworthy in this regard: conventional rank designations for officers (except generals) were restored and the new title of marshal was created in 1935; generals returned later, in 1939. Discipline and subordination were increasingly stressed as ends in themselves.[79] Tsarist military figures became heroic models, with the revival of patriotism and the national tradition after 1934, even to the extent of medals being instituted in their names. Epaulettes, the final subordination of political officers to military commanders after several false starts, the institution of Guards units, and finally changing the name "Red Army" to "Soviet Army," completed by the end of World War II the refurbishing of the army on traditionalist lines.

The general trend to income and status differentiation which proceeded during the thirties was accompanied by two especially significant developments: the elimination of social and political discrimination against the intelligentsia as such, and a growing class cleavage and diminution of mobility between the class of administrative and technical specialists and the masses of workers and peasants. Reconciliation with members of the old intelligentsia was, like so many other policy changes in this period, touched off directly by Stalin (in 1931), as the fervent class struggle of the First Five Years Plan period began to be replaced with more pragmatic considerations of social organization.[80] From this time, on, ability and skills grew steadily at the expense of political considerations as the basis for the selection of responsible personnel. Educational preference on class grounds was ended in 1934.[81]

In 1936, preparatory to the promulgation of the new constitution, the attainment of "Socialism," defined now as the elimination of class antagonisms, was officially proclaimed. Soviet society was thenceforth conceived of as comprising three "strata" or "non-antagonistic classes," the workers, the peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia. At the same time, the new constitution eliminated all political disabilities based on former membership in the old ruling classes. Thus, by 1936, the theoretical route was paved for the recovery of the leading social position by the class of educated specialists, including both those remaining from the old regime, and those subsequently trained under Soviet rule. "Bolsheviks without party cards," Stalin termed them.[82] Party recognition came shortly afterwards; the negative attitude toward membership in the intelligentsia was eliminated in the Komsomol in 1936 and in the party itself in 1939, with the end of the traditional preference for proletarians.[83] This was followed with a specific attack made by Malenkov at the Eighteenth Party Conference in February, 1941, on giving consideration to social background at the expense of technical and personal qualification in the appointment of responsible party and state officials.

Not long after the educated class began to come into its own in political status and economic position, evidence began to appear of a sharpening and stiffening of the lines between the intelligentsia and the masses. Academic education had become, by 1941, the prime consideration for social advancement; for example, the technical school rather than experience as a skilled worker became the main avenue to work in industrial management.[84] Though the "unity of mental and physical labor" had long been a point in the Communist program, fitfully reflected in efforts to combine regular education with training in manual skills, the ideal was virtually abandoned in practice, though party propaganda continued to stress it. Industrial training was completely separated from academic education in 1937.[85]

A potentially serious curtailment of mobility was undertaken with the introduction in 1940 of fees for secondary and higher education, and of the draft for industrial training in the state labor reserves, which were instituted at that time. These measures had a substantial effect in channeling the careers of youth to the levels of their families, in spite of the system of educational stipends—which itself was so arranged as to give an advantage to well-to-do in non-technical lines.[86]

Why did the Soviet regime undertake a policy of deliberately cultivating social stratification, at the expense of its ideological

commitments and possible popular resentment? Like the other aspects of the over-all policy change of which it was a part, the shift to social inequality resulted from the combined effects of the adaptation of the revolutionary program to practical conditions, and of the changed nature, mentality, and orientation of the regime which resulted from that adaptation. Put into other terms, facing on the one hand conditions which, at least in Russia, made the socialist program inoperable, and on the other, general problems of industrialism not sufficiently considered in socialist thought, the Communist regime became something different from the order envisaged by pre-revolutionary theorists. What it became has been spelled out in practice: one part of this practice has been the development of a rigorously organized system of social inequality.

The cultivation of a privileged stratum of qualified and reliable executives has quite probably been an essential condition of the success and stability of the regime under existing conditions.[87] The Soviet intelligentsia approaches the position of a ruling class, in the sense that relying on it, the regime has had to adapt itself to the interests of this group in order to keep it functioning satisfactorily.

War-Time and Post-War Developments

The new equilibrium in Soviet intellectual life suffered a temporary partial disturbance during World War II. Under the stress of war the regime sought additional sources of support by extending further some of the shifts toward traditionalist policy which had been accomplished by 1936-37, particularly as regards patriotism, Great-Russian nationalism, concessions to the Church, the symbolic trappings of authority, and the glorification of martial exploits. Slowness in this direction had perhaps been dictated by the requirement of maintaining the rationalization of policy in terms of Marxist-Leninist theory by gradual modifications in the interpretation of the latter. In the war emergency this ideological consideration fell into abeyance; a direct appeal was made to nationalist and traditionalist sentiment. Insofar as intellectual work headed in this general direction, ideological strictures upon it were greatly relaxed—and because of the natural primacy of patriotism at a time of foreign invasion, virtually all intellectual work proceeded freely to the satisfaction of the regime. Generally speaking, during the war, ideology was in all aspects of life superseded by direct sentiments of patriotic fervor, as the mental cement binding the activities of the population

to the purposes of the regime. This was fortunate for the regime —indeed, it was crucial for its survival, for under the extreme stress of war the regime could not have compelled allegiance as it did before or afterwards.

Soviet intellectuals were thus given comparatively free reign to contribute their best to the nation in its war effort. Quite naturally, in view of the war-time alliance with the Western democracies and under conditions of relative freedom, intellectual contacts and sympathy with the West grew. In some respects the situation resembled that prevailing during the NEP, with little direct party intervention in intellectual life, and with Soviet intellectuals participating (as far as was possible under war conditions) in an international community. Even some of the variety of the NEP reappeared, with some modernist and esoteric trends in the arts. The deviators were evidently tolerated however as long as the great bulk of Soviet intellectual work was under conditions of relative freedom contributing substantially to the regime's goal of winning the war.

Victory was bound to lead to changes. The nature of the Soviet political system required the firm re-imposition of ideology and ideological controls in all aspects of life, to replace the spontaneous discipline which national defense had created to bolster the regime during the war. Through a series of purges, involving reprimands, demotions, denunciations, recantations, and in a few extreme cases, apparently, liquidation, the principle of party supremacy and the authority of the party line have been re-established in virtually all fields of intellectual activity.

The campaign against the ideological laxity left over from the war was launched in the summer of 1946 with a devastating attack on two literary journals, followed by similar criticism of the theater and films. The common theme of the attacks was the dangerous penetration of bourgeois cultural influences, of "works which cultivate a non-Soviet spirit of servility before the contemporary bourgeois culture of the West," [88] which Zhdanov described as "putrid and baneful in its moral foundations." [89] Efforts to reinstill a sense of militant party spirit in other fields followed in quick succession, notably in philosophy, music, history, and law. Later, in 1949, the focus of the party's re-educational efforts was shifted back to literature, in the campaign against "cosmopolitanism," with its anti-Semitic overtones.

In the meantime, the natural sciences, which had before the war remained comparatively free of direct party interference, began to feel the strictures of the party's demand for militant

participation in the struggle against all forms of bourgeois ideology. Serious controversy has been concentrated in biology: the famous genetics controversy appears to be, in fact, something more than another instance of ideological re-tightening. In this case, the discipline in question was subjected in 1948, under Lysenko, to a regime resembling the original imposition of party controls and extreme Marxist doctrine which was experienced in most fields during the first phase of the great ideological changes of the thirties. Biology was not the only instance where the party was slow in getting around to the exclusive assertion of its primacy: the doctrines of Marr in linguistics were likewise enforced rigorously only after the war. In the latter case, the second-period reaction has already occurred. When the Marrists' vigorous enforcement of their extreme Marxist (and linguistically ridiculous) theories threatened practical damage to linguistic work, their doctrine was repudiated and replaced with essentially traditional linguistic principles. Lysenko may be expected to fall likewise as soon as his detrimental effect on Soviet biology becomes evident.[90]

In general, the ideological pattern set by the party's criticisms of the post-war intellectual work appears to be a reinforcement of the pseudo-Marxist rationalization of the trend to traditionalism, which has continued to develop. Struggle with bourgeois ideology supplies the dominant theme. Another is the renewal of efforts to check modernist and esoteric trends and the notion of art and science as ends in themselves, which began to reappear during the relative freedom of the war period. Problems stemming from both stages of the ideological transformation of the thirties are present; both to maintain political supremacy and to obtain the desired conservative content, the party has to exert continuous pressure.

The Present Role of Soviet Ideology

The reimposition of rigorous ideological strictures after the war brings into focus the basic question of the role of ideology in the Soviet political system as it stands today. Having thoroughly transformed the programmatic basis of the social order, why does the regime persist in claiming to represent the revolution? Why does it continue to enforce a body of doctrine which for its maintenance requires comprehensive control of thought and expression, with the consequences of intellectual stagnation and widespread disaffection? There are roughly five facets to the explanation.

(1) The retention of orthodox belief by the top leadership is a question impossible to decide. It is unimportant from the standpoint of analyzing Soviet policy, for invariably practical considerations prevail and ideology is reinterpreted as much as is necessary so that it can serve to justify any policy. Perhaps, the Soviet leaders really believe that they are leading humanity on the road to the great goal of communism, despite the zig-zags of the path and the necessity of silencing doubters. Such a belief would account for the basic insistence on faith in the Soviet regime as the embodiment of the proletarian revolution. It should be borne in mind however that the ultimate faith is not likely to have any effect on policy even if it should appear to conflict with the regime's short-term interests in power and stability. Even if the top leadership had ceased to take doctrine seriously, it would be inconceivable for it to admit—by declaring socialism to be nonsense, for example, and allowing free expression of any ideas short of sedition—that it had for a long time been wrong or cynical.

(2) Some political support accrues to the regime on the basis of the revolutionary ideology. Ideology has given and no doubt still gives the regime and its agents a sense of moral justification for the stern exercise of power. It serves to support the conviction that what the government is doing must be correct. Much support is derived from ideologically motivated enthusiasm.[91] By contradicting unpleasant realities ideology has made potential opponents unsure of themselves and has kept them from breaking with the regime until too late.[92] Finally, ideology seems to play a part in the driving motivation of the fanatic personality which figures importantly in the party control apparatus.[93]

(3) The post-war ideological retightening has made particularly evident the role of the ideological system in controlling what the regime regards as the vital educational functions of intellectual and political activity. A distinctive feature of the Soviet system is the complete subordination of all organized social activity to the purpose of the state, and a rigid and authoritative form is required for stating those purposes, to guide the activities that bear on the molding of citizens' minds. The official ideology, as amended and reinterpreted, serves as such a guide and standard.

(4) The foreign support enjoyed by the Soviet state comes largely if not entirely from people abroad who identify the Soviet regime, because of its revolutionary ideology, with their own revolutionary aspirations. This support is extremely important

in the over-all international power position of the Soviet Union and cannot be dispensed with, although it involves serious complications and weaknesses.

Hence, to maintain the allegiance of its foreign sympathizers, the regime has to profess the purity of its revolutionary ideology. This requirement is especially important in limiting the rapidity with which ideological changes can be introduced without causing embarrassment abroad (since foreign Communist parties not in power are not insulated from divergent points of view). Here also is one reason why Soviet reality has to be concealed by keeping contact between the Soviet Union and the outside world at a minimum. This situation has contributed to high rates of defection and turnover among the membership of some foreign Communist parties.

(5) The Soviet political and social system as it has now crystallized has a basic need for an external enemy. The functions served by the postulation of threatening foreign forces include: (a) justification of the economic privation and rigorous controls which have to be imposed in the interest of building national power; (b) a partial outlet for the hostility generated by the rigors of the regime; (c) a stimulus for the evocation of patriotic defense motives, which are an important source of strength for the regime; (d) explaining internal deviants as agents of foreign powers or as influenced by the domestic element of the international enemy, "survivals of bourgeois ideology in people's consciousness." The attack on bourgeois ideology is the basis of the entire campaign for discipline and enthusiasm for the goals set by the state. International hostility furthermore provides justification and reinforcement for the policy of keeping contact with the West at a minimum, which in turn is necessary to curtail disaffection and to prevent the free circulation of ideas which might challenge the official ideology. Finally, the conflict situation fits well the military state of mind which has prevailed in Soviet politics, in part since the Revolution and completely since 1929. The Soviet regime—and it is far from alone in this—evidently cannot conceive of politics and political measures except as aspects of a struggle against an enemy. In this respect Marxist-Leninist ideology is extremely important; not only does it define the enemy, but it actually creates the sense of enmity—on both sides. Without ideology, there would be little material basis for the present East-West conflict. Thus we have the paradoxical situation where an ideology highly at variance with actual Soviet practice is maintained with great effort to create the artificial

sense of conflict and foreign danger which the Soviet regime requires for its internal stability.

One fact, I hope, should be quite clear, even from this cursory view of the trends in official Soviet thought during the nineteen-thirties: that the Soviet regime has changed in its essence, since the revolution. The pattern of changes within the core of the official ideology, the official purpose-system, cannot convincingly be written off as a series of mere tactical ruses or strategic zig-zags. The Soviet regime has no higher conception of society or social purpose or of the objectives of its own existence than the ideology which has been under discussion here—which ideology has been reduced to an instrument for rationalization after the fact. It has apparently lost all long-run directing power, no matter what the direction. There is no fixed star for the Soviets to steer by; they have no ultimate pattern which has not thus been subject to reshaping over the years. Whether for better or for worse, regardless of its labels, the Soviet regime today does not represent the same movement as that which took power in 1917. This, I think, should be a basic premise for those who undertake to establish just what that regime actually is.

Notes

1. I am indebted to the Russian Center of Harvard University and to the Center for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for contributing to the support of the study and research which underlie this paper, and to my former colleagues at the Russian Research Center for many valuable discussions, without which the interdisciplinary approach of this paper could not have been attempted.

2. There are works which are noteworthy exceptions in their broader grasp of the picture: See Nicholas Timasheff, The Great Retreat (New York: Dutton, 1946); Harold Berman, Justice in Russia (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950); Raymond Bauer, The New Man in Soviet Psychology (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952); Klaus Mehnert, Stalin vs. Marx (London: Allen and Unwin, 1952).

3. For suggestions relevant to the psychological functions of Soviet social policy, see T. W. Adorno and others, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950); Bauer; Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941); Wilhelm Reich, The Mass Psychology of Fascism (New York: Orgone Institute Press, 1946).

4. Stalin, "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists" (December 1924), in Problems of Leninism (Moscow, 1940), p. 95.

5. Quoted in Harriet Borland, Soviet Literary Theory and Practice During the First Five Year Plan, 1928-1932 (New York: King's Crown Press, 1950), p. 13.

6. Quoted in Borland, p. 14. For a general discussion of the arts in the twenties and early thirties, see Max Eastman, Artists in Uniform (New York: Knopf, 1934).

7. John C. Fiske, "Dostoevsky and the Soviet Critics, 1947-48," American Slavic and East European Review, February, 1950, p. 45.

8. Quoted in Borland, pp. 33-34.

9. Edward J. Brown, The Proletarian Episode in Russian Literature, 1928-1932 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), contends that RAPP was abolished because the party found its control work inadequate. However, in the context of the present paper, it appears that more positive rejection was involved.

10. Kurt London, The Seven Soviet Arts (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), p. 61.

11. See ibid.

12. Gleb Struve, Soviet Russian Literature, 1917-50 (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951), p. 242.

13. See Adorno, et al., op. cit.

14. See his speech to the Soviet Writers' Congress, 1934, in Problems of Soviet Literature (New York: International Publishers [1935]), p. 65.

15. Literaturnaia gazeta, March 23, 1946.

16. Paul Aron, "The Impact of the First Five Year Plan on Soviet Historiography" (unpublished seminar paper, Russian Research Center, Harvard University); E. Maksimovich, "Istoricheskaia nauka v SSSR i Marksizm-Leninizm" (Historical Science in the USSR and Marxism-Leninism), Sovremennyia zapiski (Contemporary Notes), (Paris), XXXII (1936).

17. Aron.

18. "Some Questions Concerning the History of Bolshevism" (a Letter to the Editors of Proletarskaia revoliutsiia [The Proletarian Revolution]), in Problems of Leninism, p. 389.

19. Izvestiia, May 16, 1934; translated in the Slavonic and East European Review, July 1934, pp. 204-205.

20. Ibid.

21. Text of the decree in Istorik marksist (The Marxist Historian), 1936, No. 1, pp. 3-5.

22. M. Kammari, "Teoreticheskie korni oshibochnykh vzgliadov M. N. Pokrovskogo v istorii" (The Theoretical Roots of the Erroneous Views of M. N. Pokrovsky in History), Pod znamenem marksizma (Under the Banner of Marxism), 1936, No. 4, p. 7.

23. P. Drozhdov, "Reshenie partii i pravitel'stva ob uchebnikakh po istorii i zadachi sovetskikh istorikov" (The Decision of the Party and the Government on Textbooks in History and the Tasks of Soviet Historians), Istorik marksist, 1936, No. 1, p. 22.

24. P. Miliukov. "Velichestvo i padenie M. N. Pokrovskogo" (The Greatness and Fall of M. N. Pokrovsky), Sovremennyia zapiski, 1937, p. 384.

25. Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Congress of the CPSU (B), in Problems of Leninism, p. 529. Italics mine.

26. See Berman, pp. 35-37.

27. See Harold J. Berman and Donald H. Hunt, "Criminal Law and Psychiatry: The Soviet Solution," Stanford Law Review, July 1950, p. 635.

28. Berman, pp. 30-33.

29. Ibid., pp. 43-50.

30. Ibid., p. 47; Berman and Hunt, p. 635.

31. For a more extensive discussion of developments in Communist political theory both before and after the revolution, see my article, "The State and Revolution: A Case Study in the Genesis and Transformation of Communist Ideology," The American Slavic and East European Review, February 1953.

32. Stalin, "Foundations of Leninism" (1924), in Problems of Leninism, p. 80.

33. Ibid.

34. Stalin, Political Report to the Sixteenth Party Congress, Leninism (New York: International Publishers, 1933), II, 402.

35. Stalin, Report to the Seventeenth Party Congress, in Problems of Leninism, pp. 517-518.

36. See Stalin, "On the Draft Constitution of the USSR," ibid., pp. 564-567.

37. See, for example, the History of the CPSU (B): Short Course (New York: International Publishers, 1939), pp. 346-348.

38. Stalin, Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the CPSU (B), in Problems of Leninism, pp. 661-662.

39. Ibid., p. 662.

40. Ibid., p. 659.

41. Stalin, Speech to the Fifteenth Party Conference, November 1926, in International Press Correspondence (1926), p. 1350.

42. M. J. Shore, Soviet Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), p. 189.

43. Ibid., pp. 138-141; Lenin, "Better Less But Better" (March 1923), in Selected Works (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1951), II.

44. Lenin, draft of a party program, 1919, cited in Shore, p. 144.

45. See Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed (New York: Doubleday Doran, 1937), pp. 180-181.

46. Shore, p. 155.

47. Ibid., p. 156.

48. Bauer, p. 43.

49. Shore, pp. 156-161.

50. Ibid., pp. 172-174, 191-192; Timasheff, pp. 213-214; Bauer, p. 45.

51. Ibid., pp. 94-96.

52. Timasheff, pp. 214-218.

53. Bauer, p. 124; Shore, pp. 176-179.

54. Ibid., pp. 193-195.

55. Ibid., pp. 220-247.

56. Bauer, pp. 43-44.

57. Timasheff, p. 195.

58. Ibid., p. 315.

59. For the texts of laws and for much interesting Soviet commentary, see Rudolph Schlesinger, ed., Changing Attitudes in Soviet Russia: The Family in the USSR (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949), a collection of source materials which vividly documents the changes in official attitudes and policies.

60. Pravda, May 28, 1936, cited in Schlesinger, ed., The Family in the USSR, p. 252.

61. S. Vol'fson, "Sotsializm i sem'ia" (Socialism and the Family), Pod znamenem marksizma (Under the Banner of Marxism), 1936, No. 6, p. 64.

62. Trotsky, pp. 151-152.

63. Sotsialisticheskaia zakonnost' (Socialist Legislation), No. 2, cited in Timasheff, p. 198.

64. Komsomolskaia pravda, June 4, 1935, cited in Timasheff, p. 202.

65. See Timasheff, p. 317-318.

66. Ibid., p. 203.

67. Shore, pp. 215-216.

68. Alex Inkeles, "Family and Church in the Postwar USSR," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, May 1949, p. 34.

69. Timasheff, p. 317.

70. Inkeles, "Family and Church," p. 38.

71. See Timasheff, pp. 228-229.

72. Ibid., pp. 231-234.

73. Lenin, State and Revolution (New York: International Publishers, 1932), pp. 91-92.

74. See Barrington Moore, Soviet Politics, The Dilemma of Power (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. 183.

75. See Moore, pp. 184-186.

76. Stalin, "New Conditions, New Tasks" (June 23, 1931), in Problems of Leninism, pp. 371-372.

77. Cf. Moore, p. 185, and note 99, p. 445.

78. Stalin, "Address to the Graduates from the Red Army Academies," May 4, 1935, in Problems of Leninism; Moore, pp. 238-239.

79. See Rudolph Schlesinger, The Spirit of Post-War Russia (London: Dobson, 1947), pp. 123-124, for an apologist's admissions.

80. See Stalin, "New Conditions, New Tasks," in Problems of Leninism.

81. See Schlesinger, The Spirit of Post-War Russia, p. 40.

82. Ibid.

83. Merle Fainsod, How Russia Is Ruled (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 226, 246.

84. Alex Inkeles, "Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union," American Sociological Review (August 1950), p. 477.

85. Shore, pp. 193-195.

86. Inkeles, "Social Stratification," pp. 473-476.

87. See ibid., p. 479; Moore, passim.

88. Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU, August 14, 1946, quoted in George S. Counts and Nucia Lodge, The Country of the Blind—The Soviet System of Mind Control (Boston, Mass.: Houghton-Mifflin, 1949), p. 80. (This work provides an extensive and well-documented treatment of the post-war intellectual disciplining.)

89. Andrei Zhdanov, speech to the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, August 21, 1946, quoted in Counts and Lodge, p. 95 (condensed text in Zhdanov, Essays on Literature, Philosophy, and Music [New York: International Publishers, 1950]).

90. The foregoing was written before indications appeared in the Soviet press in the spring of 1954 that Lysenko was indeed falling into disfavor.

91. See M. Fainsod, "The Komsomols—A Study of Youth Under Dictatorship," American Political Science Review, March 1951.

92. See F. Beck (pseud.) and W. Godin (pseud.), Russian Purge and the Extraction of Confession (New York: Viking, 1951).

93. Ibid.; cf. Henry Dicks, "Observations on Contemporary Russian Behavior," Human Relations, V, No. 2 (1952), pp. 130-131.

PAN-SLAVISM AND CZECHOSLOVAK POLICY DURING WORLD WAR II

By Václav Beneš
Associate Professor of Government at Indiana University

The Czechs and Slovaks, in their culture, civilization, and way of life, have relatively little in common with their Slavic kinsmen to the east. Early in their history these two peoples became Westernized, and their entire social and political thinking developed within the intellectual framework of Western Europe. In the Middle Ages the Czechs took a prominent part in the great movement which the British historian Arnold Toynbee describes as the revolution of the West.[1] The Bohemian Reformation, in its revolt against the absolutism of medieval Church and State and in its insistence on freedom of conscience and equality of men, became a forerunner of the English and American revolutions, and it thus contributed to the Western heritage.[2]

The Europeanization of the region known today as Czechoslovakia was, however, not a peaceful process. More often than not, it involved a desperate struggle, especially against the Germanic tribes whose advance to the east posed a serious threat to the Central European Slavs. Toward the end of the eighteenth century, indeed, it appeared as if the Czechs would inevitably follow the fate of the Slavic tribes along the Elbe which succumbed to Germanization. František Palacký, the Czech historian and national leader, characterized the meaning of his nation's history as follows: "Czech history is the ground on which from time immemorial the antagonisms of Germanism and Slavism have broken out in their sharpest form and have come to their clearest focus. The essential content of Czech history is a perpetual struggle between the German and Slav elements."[3]

The Czech national revival, at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, coincided with German political revival and efforts toward unification; it made this problem particularly acute. The Slovaks were similarly exposed to the denationalization policies of the government in Hungary. Realizing the precariousness of their national existence, the Czechs and Slovaks sought outside help in their endeavors toward cultural, and later political, emancipation. They found assistance not only

in the spiritual movements of European liberalism but also in the consciousness of kinship of blood and language to the other Slavic peoples—in particular, to the Russians. This sentiment, which the Czechs and Slovaks shared especially with the southern Slavs, found its expression in a movement which has been given the name of Pan-Slavism. As understood in Bohemia and Slovakia, Pan-Slavism, or Slavism, as it was known there,[4] had as its main aim close co-operation, especially cultural co-operation, among all Slavic peoples; in the realm of politics, it demanded the co-ordination of Slavic efforts toward political liberty and national independence, under the guidance and protection, and if necessary, with active help, of Russia, the most powerful representative of Slavdom.

Pan-Slavism provided the Czechs and Slovaks with a psychological prop. It gave them a feeling that in their struggle against the Germans and Magyars they were fighting, not with their backs against a wall, but rather as a vanguard of a great and invincible power. The motives of the Pan-Slav movement were derived, in the last analysis, from the instinct of self-preservation—the ultima ratio of the policies of every nation and state.

This was the main reason that Pan-Slavism and its main component, Russophilism, have played such an important role in the modern political life of the Czechs and Slovaks. Its influence on their political thinking and the policies of their government during the Second World War can be understood only within the context of modern Czech and Slovak history.

I. A Century of Pan-Slavism

The tradition of Slavic national consciousness is not a product of the nineteenth century; among the Czechs and Slovaks it dates back to the period of Greater Moravia, at the end of the ninth century.[5] Yet it was only the development of European nationalism, brought about by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, that gave rise to a conscious movement toward Slav co-operation.

The modern development of Czechoslovak Pan-Slavism, as Thomas Masaryk pointed out,[6] was largely influenced by German science and philosophy. However paradoxical this may appear, it was the Germans who helped to promote a movement which, from its very beginning, was directed against them. The works of Schlötzer,[7] the first to call attention to the tremendous strength of the Slavs, fired the imagination and increased the self-confidence of the Czechs and Slovaks. Josef Dobrovský, the pioneer of Slavic philology, was inspired by the philosophy of the German enlightenment. It was, however, the humanitarian philosophy of Herder, the

visionary prophet of a glorious future for all Slavs,[8] which called forth a true revolution in the Slavic world, especially in Bohemia.

Herder's teaching was eagerly adopted by the second generation of Czechoslovak revivalists, led by Kollár, Šafařík, and Palacký. His idealized and romantic concept of the Slavs, whom he identified with peace, humanitarianism, and democracy, was accepted as gospel, and it became a powerful instrument of the growing national consciousness of the Czechs and Slovaks. Herder imparted to Czechoslovak Pan-Slavism a universalist, liberal, and Western democratic tendency which regarded the co-operation of Slavs as a stepping stone toward the achievement of world peace and brotherhood. Jan Kollár, the author of The Daughter of Sláva,[9] elaborated the first theory of all-Slav co-operation, the theory of Slavic reciprocity.[10]

It must be admitted that Kollár's Slavism was still very subdued and passive, in that it was limited to cultural and literary reciprocity and intentionally avoided all political issues. Nevertheless, it is impossible to deny his profound political significance. His Daughter of Sláva was by no means a mere expression of literary enthusiasm; it was a political prophecy and a definite program of action. In it all the problems of modern Slavdom were dealt with, beginning with the question of defense against the Germans and ending with the issue of Slavic unity under the leadership of Russia. Referring to the predicament of the Slovaks, Kollár, in the prelude to The Daughter of Sláva, offers them as a possible course in their struggle for preservation, close association with Russia:

> To the heavens raise your eyes, Tatra's bewildered son;
> Or better, cling with all might to yonder aged oak
> That weathered the ravage of time unto this very day.[11]

The idea of Slavic reciprocity, in spite of its immense popularity, had no solid foundation of concrete knowledge of the Slavic world. The romantic lovers of Slavdom knew practically nothing about the actual political, cultural, and economic conditions prevailing among the Slavic peoples, particularly the Russians.[12] They were fascinated by the immense power and what they considered the world mission of the Russian nation.

The first shock of reality came during the Polish uprising of 1831, when many Czech youths sided with the Poles.[13] Equally significant in countering the romantic dreams of Slavism with real knowledge of Russia were the writings of Karel Havlíček, who next to Palacký was the most important Czech political personality of the mid-century; he was one of the few Czechs of the

time to acquire a first-hand knowledge of Russia.[14] He returned from Moscow with no illusions about Russian society or reciprocity among the Slavs.[15]

In this atmosphere, there was little chance for Kollár's idea of Slavic reciprocity to be translated into a political program when, in 1848, the Czechs and Slovaks entered the Austrian political arena. At the First Slav Congress in Prague,[16] Austro-Slavism, the political co-operation of the Slavs within the Habsburg Empire, prevailed over the rather misty and unrealistic concepts of Pan-Slavism.[17] It urged the necessity of transforming Austria into a democratic federation in which the Slavs would form a majority.[18] Austro-Slavism did not, however, imply that the Slavs should turn their backs on Russia: Palacký maintained that federalization could be successful only if accompanied by an understanding between Austria and Russia.[19]

But the hopes for a regeneration of Austria failed. The Czechs and Slovaks almost instinctively began to return to the idea of Slavic co-operation on a broader basis. Even Havlíček, cautioning that "those who reject small Pan-Slavism (Austro-Slavism) should be careful not to bring about the 'big Pan-Slavism'"[20] clearly indicated that, should there be a choice between Austrian and Russian despotism, the Czechs would prefer the Russian brand.[21] Not even the second Polish uprising, that of 1863, which temporarily split Czech public opinion, could reverse the trend toward Russophilism.

The Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867, which divided the Empire between the Germans and the Magyars, dealt a mortal blow to the political aspirations of the Czechs and Slovaks. The Czechs, frustrated in the West, now turned their eyes to the East. The political defeat in Vienna was followed immediately by the famous Czechoslovak "pilgrimage" to Moscow, led by František Palacký, to attend the Second Slav Congress.[22] The pilgrimage was meant to be a demonstration against Vienna, but politically it yielded very meager results. It very clearly proved the lack of official Russian interest in the Western Slavs, and the divergence of views between the Westernized Czechs and Slovaks and the Russian Slavophils. The Czechs and Slovaks remained politically isolated in Austria;[23] however, in this isolation they failed to draw the logical consequences from their experience in Moscow.

The following period was characterized by uncritical Russophilism, which permeated the whole of Czech public life. Perhaps most characteristic was Palacký's change of mind.[24] For many

years, the Czechs refused to participate in the Vienna Reichsrat, and thereby they created an atmosphere which was very favorable to the unrealistic and nebulous concepts of Pan-Slavism and especially to Russian-Czech co-operation. Their actual knowledge of Russia and its internal conditions had increased very little, and, in particular, the nation at large had a very unrealistic idea of the character and policies of their eastern "brother." The return to active participation in Austrian politics in 1879, ostensibly on a platform of Austro-Slavism, in no way lessened Czech enthusiasm for Russia, which was generally regarded as the main counterforce to Pan-Germanism.

It was not surprising that in this setting Thomas Masaryk's realistic approach to Slavdom and Russia was understood by only a minority of his compatriots. His criticism of shallow Pan-Slavism and empty pro-Russianism went unheeded by the majority of the nation.[25] This critical stand prevented Masaryk from taking a more positive attitude toward the Neoslavism of Karel Kramář, which aimed at close co-operation among the Slavs and a rapprochement between Austria and Russia.[26]

The main test of Czechoslovak Slavism came during the First World War. The Czechs and Slovaks were appalled by the prospect of having to fight against the Russians and the Serbs, whom they had been taught to consider as their Slavic brothers. Tens of thousands of soldiers deserted to the Russian "enemy." A large part of the Czech leadership thought of the war as an opportunity to realize full national independence and dreamed—in keeping with their Pan-Slav traditions—of a Czechoslovak state to be created in close community with Russia.[27]

It was mainly due to Thomas Masaryk that the center of the Czechoslovak liberation movement was established in the West. Masaryk distrusted the Tsarist regime and had little faith in the internal strength of Russia. Moreover, he regarded the war as a conflict between autocracy and democracy and urged his nation to combine its strength with that of the latter. Yet during the first three years of the war, the liberation movement relied heavily on Russia;[28] it was there that the first Czechoslovak Army was constituted in 1915. Only after the outbreak of the March Russian revolution did the political emphasis begin to shift to the West. Masaryk welcomed the March revolution and personally established friendly relations with its leaders. Later, when the Bolsheviks took over, Czechoslovak sympathies cooled off, in particular after the conflict between the Bolsheviks and the Czechoslovak Legion. Although Masaryk very strongly rejected Bolshevism,[29]

he insisted, at the same time, on a policy of strict neutrality and non-interference in Russian affairs.[30]

The creation of independent Czechoslovakia was essentially due to the victory of the Western democracies. After World War I, Czechoslovakia found its place within the Western political system, which, on the European continent, was based on the predominance of France and the League of Nations' concept of collective security. The temporary disappearance of the German menace, as well as the emergence in Russia of Communism, which was opposed by the majority of the Czechs and Slovaks, tended to obliterate, or at least to blunt, the idea of Slavic brotherhood and traditional Czechoslovak Russophilism. Nevertheless, interest in Russia and the Russian people remained. It found its expression not only in the generous support given to Russian exiles[31] but also in a realistic approach to the Soviet Union itself. Although Czechoslovakia was one of the last states to recognize the Soviet Union de jure, its official representatives, Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Beneš, rejected military intervention[32] and maintained that without Russia, European peace could not be permanently secured.[33]

The triumph of Hitler in Germany and the emergence of the Nazi military menace completely changed the European political scene, upsetting entirely the post-1918 balance of power. Because of its geographical position, Czechoslovakia realized perhaps earlier than any other European power the far-reaching consequences of this change. Its policy of rapprochement with the Soviet Union, which was ultimately expressed in the treaty of May 1935, was determined by an endeavor to re-establish European equilibrium by means of an alliance between the East and the West. The dependence of the operation of this treaty on the French-Soviet agreement of the same year proved clearly that the new policy had little in common with traditional Pan-Slavism. Nor could it be described as an attempt at a new aggressive Pan-Slavism with a Communist content.[34]

In 1938 the collapse of the system of collective security and the indications of a policy of appeasement in the West exposed the weakness of Czechoslovakia's international position between Germany and Russia. By September 1938 it appeared that the attempts of twenty years to overcome this geographical disadvantage by a close association with Western democracies had failed. Recalling Palacký's interpretation of Czech history, the Czechoslovaks regarded their conflict with Nazi Germany as a continuation of the age-old struggle between the Slav and the Teuton. It was only

natural that they began to look to Russia for support. Hitler's scorn and hatred of the Slavs called forth, especially in the broad masses of the people, the old sentiment of Slavic solidarity and Russophilism.[35]

II. The Soviet Union and Munich

The complete diplomatic history of the period of Munich is still to be written. Much is still not known of the attitudes held by the individual governments at this time, so momentous for European, and, indeed, world history. The Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia in February 1948 prevented the complete publication of Eduard Beneš's memoirs, which would have been undoubtedly the most significant contribution to our knowledge of the Munich crisis.[36] All the crucial facts are, nevertheless, sufficiently well known, and any additional information could hardly efface, or even diminish, the significance and effects of the Munich decision, which has been described by Sir Winston Churchill as "an awful milestone in our history."[37]

The destruction of the democratic Republic had both political and psychological effects on the people of Czechoslovakia. Perhaps more important than the abandonment by France and the collapse of collective security was the fact that the West, taken as a whole, turned its back on Czechoslovakia and helped to deliver it into the hands of its enemies.

Bitterly disappointed and fearing for their continued national existence, the Czechs and Slovaks had no other choice but to look to Soviet Russia, whose attitude was then much more favorable than that of the West. During the period leading up to the Munich crisis, the Moscow government several times affirmed its determination to stand by its ally and to fulfill its obligations under the 1935 treaty. As late as September 23, 1938 (i.e., after the Anglo-French ultimatum of September 21), Maxim Litvinov, the Soviet Foreign Commissar, declared that the USSR was prepared, in accordance with the Soviet-Czechoslovak pact, to render to Czechoslovakia immediate and effective help if France would remain loyal to her ally and give similar aid, or if the League of Nations would recommend it in keeping with Articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant.[38]

There appears to be no question of the apparent willingness of the Soviet Union to fulfill the treaty obligations, but all available evidence seems to indicate that Russia was not prepared—as it is claimed by many subsequent political writers—to render to Czechoslovakia full military help, regardless of the attitude of

the French. This conclusion can be reached—apart from unequivocal official declarations of the Soviet government—from a number of statements made by the Czechoslovak President himself. Defending his decision to yield to the Munich verdict, Beneš admitted in Considerations on Slavdom that during the crisis he had considered and rejected an "isolated war" between Czechoslovakia with the help of the Soviet Union on one side and Nazi Germany, on the other.[39] His belief in the automatic help of the Soviet Union was by no means absolute; his uncertainty is shown in the following statement: "To embark on such an isolated war on one front, and to force or induce, in keeping with the treaty of 1935, the Soviet Union to take part in it. . . to me appeared to be suicidal. . . ."[40] Neither was Beneš certain of the nature and extent of possible Soviet assistance. He only "had no doubts that, in some form or another, the Soviet Union would come to our aid."[41] During the war years in London, he privately[42] expressed the conviction that the behavior of the Soviet government was dictated solely by its immediate interests; had Czechoslovakia gone to war, it could have counted, at the most, on aid similar to that given by Moscow to the Spanish government. Beneš's Memoirs, which display exceptional frankness in many respects, leave little doubt as to his opinion that in the Munich crisis Moscow made full military help dependent on French action.[43]

The friendship of the Soviet Union, allegedly going far beyond its treaty obligations, was not, however, put to the test. The Czechoslovak government capitulated. All available evidence seems to indicate that the Moscow government accepted the Czechoslovak decision, which saved it from considerable embarrassment, with the feeling of relife.[44] This is fully confirmed by the behavior of the Czechoslovak communists in the period following Munich. While condemning the capitulation as a "conspiracy against the people, state, and democracy," they carefully avoided even the slightest hint that the Soviet Union might have been willing to support Czechoslovakia at any cost.[45] Only in 1949, after the communist seizure of power, did Klement Gottwald, the leader of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, make the surprising assertion that in September 1938, Stalin offered direct military help to Czechoslovakia on condition that it fight and ask the USSR for help. The offer, which Stalin was supposed to have made to Gottwald personally, was allegedly communicated to President Beneš, who is said, however, to have taken no action.[46] That the disclosure, which could have been made any time after Munich, came only after the 1948 coup d'état, raises serious doubts as to its authenticity.

It is hardly believable that the Czechoslovak communists would not have made use of it in the period of German-Soviet understanding, as an argument against the liberation movement, which they opposed. Gottwald's story seems rather to be one of the many propaganda fabrications by which the present communist government endeavors to increase the prestige of the Soviet Union and to discredit the representatives of democratic Czechoslovakia in the eyes of the Czech and Slovak people.

Yet in the tragic days of Munich, the Soviet record appeared to be unblemished. Russia in no way participated in the Munich verdict, it publicly declared its willingness to fulfill its treaty obligations, and, after the capitulation of Czechoslovakia, it energetically condemned the action committed against its ally. These mere facts were regarded as sufficient evidence of its faithfulness to its treaty obligations. The awareness that the Munich decision was also directed against the Soviet Union gave rise to a consciousness of community of fate between the two peoples.

The crash of a whole world of ideals and beliefs, combined as it was with a deadly menace to the very existence of the nation, forced the Czechs and Slovaks to revise their relationship to the outside world. In the hour of their utmost trial, friendship and alliance with the Western democracies were of no avail. France and England not only abandoned their Central European sister, the only democratic state east of the Rhine, but also took part in her humiliation.

Although much more disastrous and tragic than the political defeat at the time of the Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867 (which took place in the relatively liberal atmosphere of Austria), Munich called forth a similar political and psychological reaction. The Czechs and Slovaks, filled with resentment against the West, turned their eyes to the East—to those who had been traditionally regarded as protectors of small Slavic nations. And, indeed, in 1938 there was much in the international diplomatic record of the Soviet Union which would seem to justify the faith and hopes of the Czechoslovak people: the Soviet government had condemned Japanese aggression in China, had spoken against Italian aggression in Ethiopia, and was favoring of strengthening the League of Nations. Faced with the prospect of losing their independence and freedom, the people seemed to forget, or simply disregard, the basic ideological differences between their democratic state and the Soviet Union. Even with many of those who, in the past, stood resolutely against any association with the Soviet Union, fear of imminent national destruction proved to be stronger than their horror of communism.

Such were the circumstances under which a new rebirth of Russophilism—definitely much stronger than at any time before —took place. It was based on a feeling of hopeless isolation and immediate danger rather than on any definite concept of future Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. In 1938 and after, as in the past, the Czechoslovak attitude toward Russia was determined by the menacing shadow of Pan-Germanism, which aimed at the enslavement and annihilation of the Central European Slavs. Almost automatically, faith in the Russian people revived latent feelings of Slavic solidarity. The nation returned to the nineteenth century ideals of Jan Kollár and of all those who sought the salvation of their nation in Russian strength.

III. The Rebirth of Pan Slavism

This faith in Russia, strengthened by the energetic Soviet protest against the occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia, [47] was given a serious setback by the German-Soviet treaty of August 1939 and subsequent Soviet neutrality in the early years of the Second World War. Even more depressing were the further acts of the Moscow government—the attack upon Poland, the occupation of the Baltic states, and, in particular, the war of aggression against Finland. The Czechoslovak public at home and the leaders in exile abroad well realized that all these actions were in direct conflict with the policies and principles which the Soviet government had defended at the time of Munich and, earlier, in the League of Nations.

Opinions were not lacking which, in keeping with the stand taken by the majority of the West European public, severly condemned the new Soviet foreign policy, especially the unprovoked attack upon Finland. The Czechs and Slovaks, with bitterness and sorrow, criticized the Soviet Union for starting a war, the justice of which the Czechoslovaks, despite their pro-Russianism, could not recognize. To recognize the Russian aggression as just, it was held, "would be contrary not only to the principles of humanity and the freedom of a small nation, but it also would be tantamount to condoning the Nazi attack against Czechoslovakia itself." [48]

The official leadership of the Czechoslovak liberation movement abroad nevertheless maintained a position of strict neutrality and reserve, carefully avoiding active propaganda against the Soviet Union. In his Memoirs, Eduard Beneš describes his policy as follows:

> As is obvious, I did not allow myself to be deceived by the apparent rapprochement between Germany and

> the Soviet Union . . . . From the very beginning, I excluded the possibility that any such agreement could be genuine and in any manner permanent. It could be only a measure of a transitory period and need, dictated by the opportunistic and tactical considerations of both partners.[49]

Beneš further observes:

> During this whole dramatical phase of the Soviet policy, I remained, on the whole, in a state of calm, albeit tense, expectancy, and in spite of the violent and permanent polemics in the public as to its essence and significance, I did not consider myself impelled to change my general line at all.[50]

The motives behind this Czechoslovak policy, as viewed by Beneš, must be sought, in the first place, in the recent experience of Munich. The prestige which the Soviet Union had then acquired among practically all Czechs and Slovaks was so great that the majority of Czechoslovak political leaders were reluctant to prejudice Czechoslovakia's relationship with the country which appeared to be its only friend. There is also no doubt that the traditional inclination toward Russia played a considerable role in the formulation of this Czechoslovak policy. As at many times in the past, these feelings precluded the adoption of an anti-Russian attitude.

There was a firm conviction that sooner or later the Soviet Union would be pulled into the war, and not on the side of Germany. In a report addressed to the leaders of the Czechoslovak underground movement and despatched before the conclusion of the Russo-German pact, Eduard Beneš not only predicted the imminent outbreak of war but also expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union "in the end will go against Germany, and that, in any case, it will support us politically."[51] In a broadcast from London, immediately after the collapse of France, he reaffirmed unequivocally his expectation of conflict between Russia and Germany.[52]

This conviction, perhaps more than anything else, made it possible for the liberation movement to pass in silence over Soviet actions directed against important Czechoslovak interests. In September 1939 Moscow recognized the independent state of Slovakia, created under the protection of Nazi Germany. In December of the same year, the Czechoslovak mission in Moscow was asked to discontinue its activities, and the Czechoslovak Minister was requested to leave the Soviet Union.

Despite numerous declarations by the Czechoslovak communists, endeavoring to prove ex post facto a favorable attitude of

the Kremlin toward the liberation movement,[53] the Soviets had little understanding of the cause of Czechoslovak freedom. Perhaps the only example of their good will which is worth mentioning was the attitude toward a military refugee group which, after the occupation of western Poland by the Germans, found refuge on Russian soil. The unit was interned in the Ukraine, in Kamenets-Podolsk, and was granted a status similar in many respects to that of units of the Red Army. Two contingents from this group were even allowed, before the German attack against Russia, to leave for the West in order to join the Czechoslovak Army in France.[54]

Soviet behavior caused great embarrassment and led to considerable confusion among Czechoslovak communists. Many of them could not understand why the struggle for Czechoslovak freedom, which had hitherto been supported both by their party and the Soviet government, should, after August 1939 become, in the eyes of the Soviets, despicable "service to British imperialism." Some communists, including Vlado Clementis, refused to follow this line. Disregarding the most severe sanctions which were applied against them by the party, they joined the Czechoslovak Army in France.[55]

The attack of Nazi Germany against Russia, which seemed to confirm Beneš's policy, had a tremendous influence on the Czechoslovak public at home and the government in exile in London. All the disappointment and bitterness of recent months were forgotten, and the 1938 relationship between the Czechoslovak government and the Soviet Union was fully restored.[56]

The Czechoslovaks, as members of the anti-Axis coalition, were greatly impressed by the Soviet heroic defense against the Nazi invaders; their reaction was further determined by their traditional sympathies to Russia as a great Slavic power. The sentiments which were called forth by Munich and temporarily dampened by Soviet neutrality in the early years of the struggle revived with new vigor. The Nazi aggression against the Russian people was interpreted in the light of the Czech thesis of the age-old conflict between the Slavs and the Teutons.

But it was the Soviet Union itself which, in its endeavor to revive Russia's past, started a new movement of all-Slav co-operation. On the twenty-fourth anniversary of the October Revolution, Stalin, speaking of the "great patriotic war," declared that Adolf Hitler was out to "exterminate the Slav peoples."[57] Promising aid to them, Stalin added, "We have not and cannot have such war aims as imposing our will and our regime on the Slavs

and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid."[58] The speech was a signal for the launching of a new Pan-Slavism. As early as August 1941 the first Slav Congress met in Moscow to formulate the program and the practical policies of the movement. Declaring the principle of unity in the struggle against Hitlerite Germany, the Congress accepted a policy of future peaceful co-operation of all Slavic States which was to assure to them an honorable place among other nations. It solemnly rejected the former Russian ideas of Pan-Slavism and Pan-Russianism based on Russian supremacy, and gave assurance that the new movement would be based entirely on reciprocity and equality. This co-operation was, however, not to be exclusive; it was not to preclude friendly relations with other nations.[59] There followed further congresses, manifestoes, and other activities.[60] The Moscow endeavor quickly spread to all parts of the free world where people of Slavic origin resided, in particular to England and the United States.

The Czechoslovaks became the most ardent supporters of the new movement. They saw in it a continuation and perhaps a realization of the ideals and visions by which they had lived for almost a century. It appeared that the new Slavic solidarity which was to arise out of the Second World War would be based on the idealistic conceptions of Jan Kollár. The words of Alexey Tolstoy referring to "the role of the Slav peoples in the formation of European humanism"[61] seemed to confirm their hopes.

The official policy of the Czechoslovak government in London embraced the program of Slavic solidarity and recognized its political relevance. In particular, it presented a strong argument against the pro-Nazi government of Slovakia, which took part in the war on the side of the Axis. Slavic co-operation was emphasized in the public utterances of the representatives of the liberation movement, in the Czechoslovak press in exile, and it became an integral part of post-war planning. In London a Czechoslovak Slavic Committee was started which organized meetings and published pamphlets on different problems of Slavic solidarity.[62]

The ideology of new Pan-Slavism and its apparently wholehearted acceptance by the Soviet Union seemed to vindicate the foreign policies of the government in exile. The program to create a barrier of Slavic states against German imperialism was regarded as a guarantee of future Czechoslovak security. Through its content and traditions, this new Slavism had little in common with Bolshevik doctrine and past policies; it represented perhaps the most radical deviation from the rigid ideology

of Marxism-Leninism. It offered to the non-communist majority of the Czechoslovak people an acceptable platform for the future close relations of Czechoslovakia with the Soviet Union. The fact that the Soviet government took the initiative in launching the new policy was interpreted as meaning that it was searching for a new, non-revolutionary, more orthodox, approach to its foreign relations. The principle of equality and reciprocity, solemnly declared, removed the objections which in the past had prevented an agreement between the Czechoslovak and Russian protagonists of Slavic solidarity.

Also, the new Slavic policy seemed to permit Czechoslovakia to continue its relationship with Poland without violating the spirit of the Soviet-Czechoslovak alliance. In spite of little enthusiasm on the part of the Soviet government, Czechoslovakia signed in the beginning of 1942 an agreement with the Polish government in London on the future Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation.[63]

Czechoslovak enthusiasm for the idea of Slavic co-operation, as one of the corner stones of the Russian-Czechoslovak relationship, reached its apex on the occasion of President Beneš's visit to Moscow and the conclusion of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance, and Post-War Co-operation of December 1943. It was regarded not only as an important link in the future post-war security system, comparable to the 1942 British-Soviet treaty, but also as a definite understanding between two Slavic states. In the opinion of Beneš, the treaty was "a very concrete and meaningful expression of Slavic policy."[64] And indeed the problem of future co-operation of Slavic states ranked high both on the official and unofficial agenda during his visit. In fact, Beneš's first encounter with a high Soviet official, Alexander Korneychuk, the Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who was sent to meet him at an R.A.F. base in Iraq, was largely devoted to the discussion of the "future Slavic policy of the Soviet Union."[65] Later, during the official negotiations, Molotov and Stalin himself frequently took up the same subject.[66] Also the reaction of those whom the Czechoslovak President met on less official occasions — during visits to factories, cultural institutions, and casual conversations — seemed to indicate the genuine sentiments of Slavic solidarity among the Russian people. In his Memoirs, Beneš summed up his impressions as follows: "Everything was directed toward the conduct of war, the front, post-war co-operation, and, as far as we were concerned, to our mutual co-operation and the future Slavic community."[67]

It is obvious that Eduard Beneš regarded the new Russian Pan-Slavism as a definite policy of the Soviet government. He looked upon it with particular satisfaction, because the underlying principles of new Slavism—equality and reciprocity—augured well for the future of the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty, which he had just concluded. They served him as a further guarantee that the Kremlin would abide by its treaty obligation not to interfere with Czechoslovak internal affairs.[68]

The complete success of his negotiations, as well as the cordial atmosphere in which they were conducted, confirmed Beneš's belief in the strength and genuine character of the bonds of Slav brotherhood uniting the Russian nation with the Czechs and Slovaks. Before leaving Moscow, he expressed his feelings in a highly optimistic broadcast to Czechoslovakia in which he said:

> You, my dear Czechoslovak compatriots, must conceive of my present visits in the spirit of our whole national history of the last centuries; it is an expression of what our great national revivalists saw in the Russian nation, of the esteem in which it was held by Dobrovský, Kollár, Palacký, Šafařík and Hurban Vajanský, and which was manifested by the travels to Russia of our great democrat Havliček, our Palacký and Rieger . . . .
>
> My present trip to Moscow—similarly as my visit in 1935—is not a momentary gesture of war-time policy which will be abandoned in the course of further developments; for me this visit is only a self-evident consequence, a logical conclusion, and an evolutionary termination of a policy of a century.[69]

Beneš consciously linked the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty with the new Slavic policy, regarding it as the beginning of a "new important political phase and possibly as a model for all Slavs."

His optimism was confirmed by the attitude of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, whose leaders he met during his Moscow visit. The President was greatly impressed by their ardent support of the idea of Slavic solidarity, which was even more enthusiastic than that of non-communist Czechs and Slovaks. The Czech and Slovak communists' enthusiastic acceptance of the new concept of international relations within the Slavic world—so different from their former dogmatic approach—was perhaps more surprising than their sudden patriotism and loyalty to Beneš's government in London. Casting away their rigid ideology and scorn for the "bourgeois" interpretation of history, the communist leaders began to speak with great reverence of the old Slavic traditions of the Czechs and Slovaks. Nejedlý, the Czechoslovak member of the Moscow All-Slav Committee, declared that "the Slavic idea,

which at the time of Kollár was a noble effort toward rapprochement and brotherly love among the Slav nations, today represents a real strength which will play an important role in post-war Europe."[70]

The Pan-Slav fervor of the Czechoslovak communists reached its zenith in the speech delivered by the communist leader Klement Gottwald after the conclusion of the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty. Calling the Czechs and Slovaks the outpost of Slavdom, he paraphrased the famous verses of Jan Kollár: "The dreams of the noblest thinkers of our nations have been fulfilled: our Slavic linden has found a powerful support in the mighty Russian Slavic oak."[71]

IV. Beneš's Concept of a New Slavic Policy

Eduard Beneš, like Thomas Masaryk, was a Westerner in his intellectual and general cultural background. The Republic which he helped to create rested on the Western ideology of democracy, and in its early years looked to the West for guidance and support.

Yet the main characteristic of Beneš's foreign policy was not its Western orientation but its endeavor to blend Czechoslovak national interests with the high moral purpose of the new enlightened concept of international co-operation.[72] Beneš's policy was neither Western nor Eastern, but a European and world policy, as he declared in 1942: "Our foreign policy—corresponding to two unvarying and invariable pillars of our national existence, i.e., our geographical position in Europe between the East and the West and our ten centuries of national tradition—has not been and will not be either Western only or Eastern only, but European, internationally synthetic."[73]

To the achievement of this policy Eduard Beneš devoted all his energies. He worked consistently for the strengthening of collective security and for the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe which, he held, was unobtainable without the return of Russia into the European order.

It is questionable whether the collapse of collective security and the disaster of Munich, which lay so heavily on his mind, impelled Beneš to change the basic premises of his foreign policy. The destruction of Czechoslovakia strengthened his belief in the inability of the West to give to his country sufficient protection against the dangers of Pan-Germanism. He came to the conclusion that Czechoslovak national interest required close co-operation and alliance with the Soviet Union.[74] This, however, was not to imply that Czechoslovakia should abandon another, equally important axiom of its foreign policy, namely its European and internationally

sympathetic character. The new Soviet-Czechoslovak alliance was to operate within the framework of a general understanding between the East and the West, of which understanding Beneš was an ardent champion.[75]

These basic premises of Beneš's foreign policy also provide a key to the understanding of his approach to the future role of the revived Pan-Slav movement. Although his realistic mind was unmoved by the sentimental appeal of Slav brotherhood, Beneš recognized the importance of the new policy from the point of view of the Czechoslovak relationship both to the Soviet Union and Germany.

This was perhaps the reason that in the autumn of 1944 he published The Considerations on Slavdom, a book entirely devoted to the discussion of the problem of Slav co-operation. His 1943 optimism had by then largely disappeared. Russian Pan-Slavism in no way helped to heal the split between the Soviet government and the governments of Poland and Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia's relationship with Moscow also ran into unexpected difficulties. Nevertheless, Beneš still believed in the possibility of future co-operation which he thought would play an important role in post-war Central and Eastern Europe. Rather than attempting to work out the ideology of new Slavism, Beneš in his book turned his attention to the conditions of future collaboration.

Like his predecessors, he sought the foundation of future co-operation in the ethnic, linguistic, and, to a certain degree, the cultural community of all Slavic peoples. He warned, however, against an emotional approach. To be successful, this new Slavism must rest on the firm recognition of common interests. Concrete collaboration would have to take place not only in the political, but also in the cultural and economic spheres. But Beneš cautioned the Slav nations not to permit—as had happened in the past—the abuse of cultural understanding for political purposes and its transformation into a movement toward "mystical Slavic unification."[76]

By far the most important part of Considerations of Slavdom is devoted to Beneš's thoughts on the political content of the future partnership of the Slavic states. Rejecting the reactionary spirit of Slavophilism and other Slavic messianisms of the past, Beneš held that new Slavism must be founded on a "politically democratic and popular revolutionary program."[77] To him the problem of every Slav nation was the question of the emancipation of the "man in the street," the worker and the peasant. Should this emancipation take place, Beneš foresaw for the Slavic states a strengthening and consolidation which would provide a solid foundation for their partnership.

Beneš regarded as the main political aim of the new Slavic policy the common defense against the renewal of German imperialism. He warned, however, against regarding the idea of Slavic solidarity "solely from the point of view of the conflict between the Slavs and the Germans." [78] The real mission of the Slavs, he maintained, must not be negative but positive and constructive. He indicated that the best solution of their relationship to the Germans might be found in the new collective security organization to be founded after the war. Yet defense against Germany must be regarded as the key to Beneš's concept of Slavic policy. This follows from his final judgment that, so long as Pan-Germanism has not been made impossible, "all Slavs must have a definite and common defensive policy against Germany." [79]

Finally, the policy of new Slavism, as understood by Beneš, was to secure for all Slav nations and cultures a "new position in Europe and the world." [80] Only through co-operation will they be able to achieve the same moral and political prestige as that enjoyed by the Anglo-Saxons, Germans, and the Latin nations. At the same time, Beneš remained faithful to the Czechoslovak traditional humanitarian and progressive conception of the mission of Slavdom. He expressed it as follows: "To the outside world the new Slavic policy must appear, and in all sincerity must be presented, as a contribution of all Slav nations to the post-war European and world system of collective security. And, in the end, this Slavism again must culminate in the principles of Kollár's humanity." [81] Beneš's universalism is apparent also from his discussion of the form which the new Slav co-operation might assume. He referred to the possibility of a "regional League of Nations," [82] or even a closer association on a basis similar to the British Commonwealth. But he expressed the opinion that such development should not be artificially hastened, for that might be detrimental to the consolidation of Europe. [83]

Such, then, were the conditions, the fulfillment of which Eduard Beneš regarded as essential for the post-war success of the policy of new Slavism. He frankly admitted the difficulties standing in its way. Apart from the Soviet-Polish conflict—which at that time appeared to be insoluble—Beneš saw the main obstacle in the attitude which the Soviet Union itself might later manifest. For his former optimism was gone, and doubts had begun to enter his mind as to the sincerity of the Soviet Union and the validity of its promises. [84] He no longer felt as he had in 1943; he was no longer certain whether Soviet Pan-Slavism would remain a permanent feature of the

Kremlin policy. There were important factors which, in his opinion, favored the continuation of an affirmative attitude of the Soviet Union toward post-war Slavism: the emotional ties of the majority of the Russian people to the other Slav nations, the continued German menace, and concrete practical interests. Yet Beneš considered it necessary to pose the following question: "Will Russian communism and, under its influence, the Soviet Union, return after the war to pure communist doctrine, so that war-time Slavism will appear to have been nothing but mere tactics?"[85] To this question Beneš did not find a conclusive answer. Although he admitted that Pan-Slavism in the Soviet Union "might become a permanent phenomenon,"[86] he immediately limited his judgment by stipulating the conditions under which such development could take place. First of all, the official policy of the Soviet government would have to convince the smaller Slavic states that Russian Pan-Slavism does not involve any danger to their national independence. Secondly, the Russian Bolshevik Party would have to refrain from monopolizing the idea of Slavic solidarity and transforming it into a leftist messianism, "supported by the communist parties of the smaller Slavic states."[87]

Beneš readily admitted that the Soviet Union, as the largest and most powerful Slav state, should enjoy a special position in the new system of Slavic co-operation. It would be able to contribute more to the common cause and therefore its moral position and its position as regards political power would be automatically stronger. But, in keeping with the democratic conception of new Slavism as a partnership of equals, Russia should not assume the role of protector to the smaller Slavic states. Beneš warned emphatically against any such attempts, predicting that they would ruin the chances of any future genuine understanding and collaboration among the Slavs.

The fears and doubts which at the end of 1944 caused great anxiety to the Czechoslovak President, were fully substantiated by the developments which marked the end of the Second World War in Eastern Europe. Slavic solidarity did not prevent Stalin from taking possession—even before Beneš's return to Czechoslovakia and the complete liberation of the country—of Ruthenia, the eastern-most province of the Republic.[88] Alarming reports began to arrive from the Slavic countries which were occupied by Russians, indicating that the Red Army was acting not like the army of a Slav ally but as an agent of Soviet communism.

Stalin and his associates had, however, no intention of abandoning Pan-Slav propaganda, which was very effective, especially

in Czechoslovakia. Of this President Beneš became painfully aware during his second visit to Moscow, in March 1945. He was on his way home, to the liberated territories of his country, and his stay in the Soviet capital was a critical period for the future of Czechoslovakia. Beneš's reception by the Soviet authorities, unlike that in 1943, was very cool, and the negotiations with the leaders of the Czechoslovak communists on the appointment of a new government were equally depressing, as the communists managed to secure the key positions in the new Cabinet.[89]

Perhaps the only reminder of the former atmosphere of friendship and cordiality was Stalin's reference to the Slavic policy, at the official farewell banquet given in Beneš's honor. Stalin drank a toast to the new Slavism and emphasized the determination of the Soviet government not to interfere with the internal affairs of its Slavic allies. Stalin stated, evidently for the benefit of his Czechoslovak guests: "The Soviet Union wants nothing else than to gain allies who will always be prepared to resist the German danger. The Soviet Union will not interfere with the internal affairs of its allies. I know that even among you there are such who doubt it. Perhaps even you are a little dubious, but I give the assurance that we will never interfere in the internal affairs of our allies. Such is Lenin's Neo-Slavism, which we Bolshevik communists are following. There can be no talk of a hegemony of the Soviet Union."[90]

However gratifying, the speech did not impress Eduard Beneš. For he had no reason to believe that the Soviets would honor their Slavic obligations any more than they had respected their obligations arising out of the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty.[91]

It is outside the scope of this article to deal with the brief history of post-war Pan-Slavism in Czechoslovakia. There were numerous manifestations of Slavic solidarity which, especially immediately after the liberation, attracted considerable public attention. Nevertheless, the spirit of these manifestations was alien not only to Beneš's conception of new Slavism but also to the program of the war-time All-Slav congresses in Moscow. In fact, what Beneš feared and expressed in his Considerations on Slavdom became a reality. The communists, arrogating for themselves positions of leadership, used the issue of Pan-Slavism for the purposes of their own policies. Under the disguise of Pan-Slav slogans, they prepared the ground for the domination of the country by the Soviet Union.[92]

Summary and Conclusions

The influence of the ideology of Pan-Slavism on the Czechoslovak policy during the Second World War cannot be disputed. Of course, the sovietization of Czechoslovakia, which took place in February 1948 (but really started immediately after the 1945 liberation), was caused by reasons beyond the control of the London government and the Czech and Slovak people. But Slavism and sympathy for Russia had an important share in the determination of the policies of the Czechoslovak President and his associates. These ideas and feelings also greatly influenced the thinking of the people in the country under its occupation. In summary, one can trace three main characteristics of Czechoslovak Pan-Slavism during the Second World War.

As in the past, the feeling of Slavic solidarity was based on emotional rather than rational foundations. Russia under the communists was misunderstood, being conceived of in the spirit of the national revivalists and Czech nationalists of the pre-1914 period. It is obvious that the Czechs and Slovaks, whom many political observers expected to "interpret Russia to the Western world,"[93] were ill equipped for this responsible task.

The lack of knowledge of Russia was aggravated by a wrong interpretation of the future development of Soviet Communism—the belief that Russian national traditions and practical considerations would prevail over Bolshevik dogma. It is only fair to say that in this mistake the Czechoslovaks were by no means alone, and that after Teheran and Yalta nothing else was left to them but to hope for the best.

Secondly, the key to the understanding of Czechoslovak Slavism is to be found, in the last analysis, in the relationship of Czechoslovakia to Germany. The fear of German imperialism and the desire to stop once and for all the German Drang nach Osten —which had become a deadly menace after Munich—tended to drive the Czechs and Slovaks into the hands of the Russians. Yet there can be no doubt that a large part of responsibility for this development rested with the West which in 1938 abandoned Czechoslovakia to its fate. Thomas Masaryk's observation in 1916 was again justified: the small Slavic peoples saw a powerful protector in mighty Russia, because they were constantly menaced by the Germans, whereas the western European powers displayed little interest in them.[94] Thus Munich prepared the political and psychological background for the strong revival of Pan-Slavism.

It is obvious that the return of the Russian and Czechoslovak communists to the idea of Pan-Slavism, like the revival of other national traditions, in 1941, was nothing but tactics. Pan-Slavism not only aimed at the mobilization of the Slavs in the struggle against Nazi Germany but also prepared the way for future Russian expansion.

After 1945, the Czechs and Slovaks became, for the first time in history, immediate neighbors of Russia. The spreading of Russian influence into Eastern and Central Europe did not, however, take place in the spirit of the humanitarian and democratic philosophy of Jan Kollár. What Palacký feared in the middle of the last century, the establishing of a universal Russian Empire, had become a reality. Whatever remained of the idea of Slavic solidarity was absorbed by Pan-Russian communist messianism. What happened represents an important milestone in the political thinking of the Czechs and Slovaks. When put to the test, the great dream of Slavic solidarity and brotherhood with the Russian nation proved to be an illusion.

At the end of his life, Palacký, despairing over the possibility of a just Austria and seeking consolation in Russian strength, declared that his greatest mistake had been his "faith in the reason and sense of justice of the German nation."[95] Almost a century later, Eduard Beneš, who wanted to strengthen the position of his nation by co-operation with Russia, came to a similar conclusion: "My greatest mistake," he said in September 1947, "has been my belief in Russia and in the sincerity of Stalin."[96]

Notes

1. "The Revolution We Are Living Through," The New York Times Magazine, July 25, 1954, p. 44.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

3. František Palacký, Die Geschichte des Hussitentums und Professor Constantin Höfler (Prague, 1868), quoted from S. Harrison Thomson, Czechoslovakia in European History (Princeton, 1953), p. 132.

4. In Czech and Slovak studies, the terms slovanství (Slavism), or slovanská otázka (the Slavic question) are generally used to describe the Czechoslovak brand of Pan-Slavism. It must be sharply distinguished from Russian Pan-Slavism (Pan-Russianism), as understood by some of the Slavophils and men like Danilevsky, Leontiev, or Katkov. This Russian Pan-Slavism demanded of all Slav nations that they not only submit to the leadership of Russia, but also renounce their own aspirations to an independent life, that they merge with Russia and the Russian nation and accept

the Orthodox faith. Pan-Russianism was rejected by all Czech and Slovak leaders.

5. A concise survey of the early history of Czech and Slovak Slavism can be found in Roman Jakobson's "Comparative Slavic Studies," in the Review of Politics, January 1954, pp. 67-90.

6. See Thomas Masaryk, Česká otázka (The Czech Question; Prague, 1908), pp. 36, 51.

7. August Ludwig von Schlötzer was Professor of Philosophy and Statistics at the University of Göttingen.

8. Johann Gottfried von Herder, German philosopher and critic. In his Ideen zur Philosophie der Menschheit (Eng. tr., Outline of the Philosophy of Man, 1800; Weimar, 1784-91), he regards the Slavs as bearers of true humanity and human progress.

9. Slávy dcera (The Daughter of Sláva), a poetic cycle of 645 sonnets, expressing the author's sorrow over the destruction of the Elbe Slavs and exhorting all Slavic nations to unite against the Germanic onslaught.

10. Expounded in Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation (On the Literary Solidarity Between the Various Peoples and Dialects of the Slavic Nation), published in 1837 in German; later published in Czech, Russian, and Serbian.

11. Translated by R. A. Ginsburg, in Jan Kollár, a Poet of Pan-Slavism (Chicago, 1943).

12. See Masaryk, Česká otázka, pp. 56, 71 f.

13. Ibid., p. 48.

14. Havlíček spent almost two years in Moscow as a tutor in the family of Shevyrev, prominent professor of the University of Moscow and prominent Slavophil.

15. See Thomas Masaryk, Karel Havlíček (Prague, 1920), pp. 229 f.; Hermann Münch, Böhmische Tragödie (Hamburg, 1949), p. 141.

16. Convened on June 2, 1848, and attended by 341 delegates, representing mainly the Austrian Slavs. The Whitsunday insurrection of students and workers (the Prague 1848 revolution) brought about a sudden end to the congress, on June 12.

17. See František Roubík, Český rok 1848 (The Year 1848 in Bohemia; Prague, 1948), pp. 194-218; also Münch, pp. 190-196.

18. The idea of Austro-Slavism was perhaps best expressed in the famous reply of František Palacký to the invitation to the Frankfurt German National Assembly (Vorparlament) which insisted on the necessity of Austria and rejected both Pan-Germanism and the idea of a "universal Russian Empire."

19. See Masaryk, Česká otázka, p. 89.

20. Ibid., p. 111.

21. Ibid.

22. The Czech and Slovak delegation was composed of the leaders of the political and scientific life. In addition to Palacký it included the leaders of the Old Czech Party (F. L. Rieger and F. A. Brauner) and of the Young Czech Party (J. Grégr), the painter Quido Manes, the poet K. J. Erben, and others. The Slovaks were represented by the national leaders J. Jesenský, O. Radlinský, and P. Mudroň.

23. In their opposition against the Ausgleich, the Czechs remained isolated. They failed to secure the support of the Poles and even of the Slovenes; see Milan Prelog, Pout Slovanů do Moskvy (The Slav Pilgrimage to Moscow; Prague, 1931), p. 22.

24. Toward the end of his life, Palacký lost faith in the possibility of a "just" Austria and foresaw a struggle between the Slavs and the Germans. His bitterness is expressed in his letter to J. Vaclik, a Czech settled in Petrograd: "The time will soon come when it will be necessary to punish . . . the Teutons for their pride and haughtiness, to teach them civility and justice. . . . This is the historical mission of Slavdom in general, and of Russia, in particular . . . ." The Archives of the Bohemian Museum, quoted from J. Slavik, "František Palacký a Rusko," in Zahraniční Politika (Foreign Policy), 1926, pp. 585-590.

25. Speaking of the uncritical Russophilism at the beginning of the First World War, Masaryk said: "My critical attitude toward Russia was obviously justified and correct, but now it was too late to criticize Russia publicly and to put our Russophilism into proper perspective. Also, the people, in the war-time excitement, would hardly understand my criticism. I was misunderstood by many already before the war"; Thomas Masaryk, Světová revoluce (Eng. tr., The Making of the State, 1927; Prague, 1925), pp. 28-29.

26. Neoslavism was based on the idea of freedom and equality of the Slav nations. Its impetus came from the 1905 Russian revolution, and the movement culminated in the Prague Slav Congress in 1908.

27. See Thomas Masaryk, Světová revoluce, p. 25.

28. Until the time of the Russian revolutions, the Czechoslovak revolutionary publications abroad, such as the Československá samostatnost (published in Switzerland) and La nation tchèque (published by E. Denis in Paris), emphasized the importance of Russia for the liberation movement.

29. Thomas Masaryk, Světová revoluce, pp. 209 f.

30. Ibid., pp. 222 f.; Masaryk distinguished between intervention in the internal affairs of the Bolshevik government, which he rejected as contrary to international law, and a war against Bolshevik Russia. As far as the latter possibility was concerned, he

stated expressly: "I have considered war against the Bolsheviks and Russia; I would have joined, with our military corps, an army which would have been strong enough to fight the Bolsheviks and the Germans and to defend democracy against Bolshevism. There was only one chance for such a war—the mobilization of the Japanese. To take this step not only America but also Paris and London were unwilling." Ibid., pp. 226-227.

31. See The Czechoslovak Help to the Russian and Ukraine Emigration (government publication), Prague, 1924.

32. See Masaryk's report for President Wilson of April, 1918, Světová revoluce, pp. 239 f.; also Eduard Beneš, Světová válka a naše revoluce (Eng. tr., My War Memoirs, 1928; 2nd ed., Prague, 1935), pp. 178 f.

33. See Eduard Beneš, Five Years of Czechoslovak Foreign Policy (Prague, 1924), p. 22.

34. The Soviet-German treaty of 1926 gave to the Soviet-German co-operation a much broader basis in many respects than the 1935 Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty.

35. See Petr Zenkl, "Jak to dělali" (How It Happened), Svornost (Czech daily), January 13, 1952, p. 1.

36. Eduard Beneš published only one volume of the Paměti (Memoirs) in 1947. The two volumes dealing with the period of Munich were then ready for publication; after Benes's death, however, they fell into the hands of the communist government.

37. Sir Winston Churchill, The Gathering Storm (Boston, 1948), p. 328.

38. See Maxim Litvinov, Czechoslovakia and the World Crisis (New York, 1938).

39. Eduard Beneš, Úvahy o slovanství (Considerations on Slavdom; London, 1944), p. 179; henceforth cited as Úvahy.

40. Ibid., p. 180.

41. Ibid.

42. Beneš told the present writer that during the period of Munich Czechoslovakia had no assurance that the Soviets would have taken any action at all; see also Eduard Táborský, "Beneš and Stalin—Moscow 1943 and 1945," Journal of Central European Affairs, XIII (1953), 161.

43. Eduard Beneš, Paměti (Memoirs; Prague, 1947), p. 191; henceforth cited as Paměti.

44. This follows clearly from the reference to Czechoslovakia, made by V. M. Molotov in his speech in the Moscow Soviet on November 6, 1938. Having emphasized that "the Soviet Union did not and could not participate in the conspiracy at the expense of Czechoslovakia," Molotov simply stated that "the Soviet Union

proved that its attitude toward international treaties was entirely different. It proved before the whole world that its faithfulness to treaties relating to the struggle against aggression was unbreakable." See Československé listy (The Czechoslovak Newspaper), Vol. II, No. 5, March 15, 1944, p. 8.

45. See Gottwald's speech in the Permanent Committee of the Czechoslovak National Assembly of October 11, 1938, included in Klement Gottwald's Deset Let: Sborník statí a projevů (Ten Years: Collection of Articles and Speeches; Prague, 1946), p. 120.

46. See Klement Gottwald, So Sovietským svätom na večné časy (With the Soviet Union Forever; Bratislava, 1951), p. 263.

47. Cf. text in the Czechoslovak Yearbook of International Law (London, 1942), p. 227.

48. Vojta Beneš, Světlo na křízovatkách (The Beacon on the Crossroads: Chicago, 1940), pp. 13, 41.

49. Paměti, p. 233.

50. Ibid., pp. 207-208.

51. Eduard Beneš, Šest let exilu a druhé světové války (Six Years of Exile and of the Second World War; Prague, 1946), p. 53; henceforth cited as Šest let exilu.

52. Ibid., p. 78.

53. See Zdeněk Fierlinger, Od Mnichova po Košice 1939-1945 (From Munich to Košice 1939-1945; Prague, 1946), p. 28, and passim.

54. Paměti, p. 224.

55. Clementis's war-time deviation was, however, never forgotten. In his trial in November 1952, he was charged with having taken up, when the war broke out, "an anti-Soviet attitude over the question of the Soviet-German pact and Finland, thereby drifting into the reactionary camp," Proceedings of the Trials of Slánský et al., as Broadcast by the Czechoslovak Home Service (New York, 1953), p. 65.

56. Paměti, p. 244.

57. Joseph Stalin, The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union (New York, 1945), p. 28.

58. Ibid., p. 33.

59. At the congress the program was outlined by the Soviet writer Alexey Tolstoy.

60. A complete description of the Slav activities in Moscow can be found in Albert Mousset, The World of the Slavs (New York, 1950), pp. 76 f.

61. See Hans Kohn, Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology (Notre Dame, 1953), p. 232.

62. In November 1943 a Slavic Seminar was held dealing with the Czechoslovak relationship to the other Slavs. Of the publications issued, the most important one was that of Vlado Clementis, Pan-Slavism, Past and Present (London, 1943).

63. The Czechoslovak-Polish Protocol of January 19, 1942; the Polish-Czechoslovak rapprochement started with the Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration of November 11, 1940, on post-war closer co-operation between the two states. For texts of both documents see L. W. Holborn, War and Peace Aims of the United Nations (Boston, 1943), pp. 452-453, and 467-469, respectively.

64. Úvahy, p. 195.

65. Paměti, pp. 392-393; see also Táborský, p. 159.

66. Paměti, pp. 393, 395.

67. Ibid., p. 394.

68. The treaty had a special clause (Art. 4) stipulating that the signatories would act "in accordance with the principles of mutual respect for their independence and sovereignty as well as of non-interference in the internal affairs of the other State"; for full text see Hubert Ripka, East and West (London, 1944), p. 76.

69. Šest let exilu, pp. 216-217.

70. "Pod slovanským praporem" (Under the Slavic Banner), Československé listy, Vol. I, No. 1, August 10, 1943.

71. Klement Gottwald, So Sovietským sväzom na večné časy, p. 3.

72. See Paul E. Zinner, "Czechoslovakia: The Diplomacy of Eduard Beneš," The Diplomats, 1919-1939 (Princeton, 1953), p. 102.

73. Message to the Czechoslovak State Council in London of November 12, 1942; in Holburn, p. 441.

74. See Paměti, p. 390.

75. "Our treaty . . . pulled down, to a certain extent the wall between the Soviet Union and the Western world which regarded our policy as a sort of experiment, a sort of 'test case'—an example and attempt which was to show what the Soviet Union intends to do with its smaller neighbors after the war." Ibid., p. 415.

76. Úvahy, p. 211.

77. Ibid., p. 188.

78. Ibid., p. 207.

79. Ibid., p. 216.

80. Ibid., p. 217.

81. Ibid., p. 197.

82. Ibid., p. 216.

83. Ibid.

84. See the evidence of Eduard Táborský, the personal secretary of the President: "Yet by August 1944, new worries came, soon to be followed by even more serious matters which filled Beneš's mind with uneasiness and gravely shook his faith in Stalin's promises," op. cit., p. 169.

85. Úvahy, p. 194.

86. Ibid., p. 195.

87. Ibid., p. 196.

88. Táborský, pp. 171 f.

89. See Hugh Seton-Watson, East European Revolution (London, 1950), p. 164.

90. Táborský, pp. 179-180.

91. The seizure of Ruthenia was, also in Beneš's estimation, a clear breach of the 1943 treaty.

92. The actual purpose of Soviet Pan-Slavism has been described as follows: "Then, too, the idea of Slavic solidarity had an acknowledged advantage. It allowed the leaders of the liberated countries to disguise under the appearance of fraternal solidarity the state of dependence to which they were doomed by the new eastern equilibrium." Mousset, p. 94.

93. A. J. P. Taylor, "Czechoslovakia and Europe: The Foreign Policy of Dr. Beneš," Eduard Beneš, Essays and Reflections Presented on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday (London, 1944), p. 169; R. W. Seton-Watson stated that "whatever the future may hold in store, it would seem probable that Czechoslovakia will perform an important function as a link between Eastern and Western tendencies in Europe. . ." ("Beneš and Masaryk," ibid., p. 190).

94. See Thomas Masaryk, The Slavs Among Nations (London, 1916), p. 12.

95. František Palacký, Františka Palackého spisy drobné (Writings of František Palacký; Prague, 1898), I, 339.

96. In a conversation with the present writer; see also Táborský, p. 162.

BYRON, THE BYRONIC TRADITION OF THE ROMANTIC VERSE TALE IN RUSSIAN, AND LERMONTOV'S MTSYRI

By Joseph Thomas Shaw
Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies at Indiana University

When Mikhail Yurievich Lermontov's The Mtsyri, one of the best long poems and perhaps the finest romantic verse tale in Russian, appeared in 1840, in addition to his collected short poems and his Hero of Our Time (Geroi Nashego Vremeni), connection with Byron was immediately pointed out.[1] When after Lermontov's death at less than twenty-seven in 1841 his earlier, immature works began to appear in print, it became more and more evident that Lermontov's debt to Byron was indeed great. All his critics have felt compelled to devote at least some discussion to the relationship between Byron and Lermontov, and there are several studies on the subject.[2] Comparisons have been made of their biographies and of social and political conditions of their countries and times, in an effort to find meaningful parallels. However, hitherto no detailed investigation of any genre or considerable body of Lermontov's works and no detailed study of any particular major work for the purpose of discovering specific indebtedness to Byron and the Byronic tradition in Russian has been published.[3] Critics and scholars have confined themselves almost exclusively to general comparisons and assertions of the relationship of Lermontov and Byron and of indebtedness of particular works of Lermontov to those of Byron.

The problem of the genesis of Lermontov's Mtsyri is complicated by the position of the poem in the genre of the romantic verse tale in Russian and its position in Lermontov's own poetry. Lermontov's three romantic verse tales written in his mature period—The Mtsyri (w. 1839, p. 1840), The Demon (Demon, eight versions, of which the last is dated 1841), and The Fugitive (Beglets, w. 1839)[4]—are the last Russian poems worthy of mention in this genre, which had been introduced into Russian poetry almost twenty years earlier by the greatest Russian poet, Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin, with the publication of the first of his "Byronic" verse tales, The Prisoner of the Caucasus (Kavkazskii plennik) in 1822. As Pushkin continued to write "Byronic" verse tales, a flood of similar poems by other Russian authors appeared,

usually depending more upon Pushkin's poems than upon Byron directly. Hundreds of Russian romantic verse tales were written in the 1820's, the period of greatest popularity of the genre gradually died down in the 1830's, and Lermontov's masterpieces in it brought its history to a close in Russian.

The genre of the romantic verse tale in Russian, with the exception of Lermontov's poems in it, has been studied by the Russian scholar Zhirmunsky, in his Byron and Pushkin: From the History of the Romantic Verse Tale.[5] Zhirmunsky, who was associated with the Russian Formalist group of critics,[6] through formal analysis of Byron's so-called Oriental tales and the Russian romantic verse tales beginning with Pushkin's, demonstrated that Byron has consistent formal structure, methodology, and thematic materials in his Oriental verse tales,[7] and that Pushkin borrowed from them the formal structure, methodology, and thematic elements of his own romantic verse tales, which include four complete poems and two "fragments."[8] The chief formal characteristics of Byron's Oriental tales, as Zhirmunsky analyzes them, include a typical method of construction of the poem, based on fragmentariness, the presentation of only a small number of "high points" of action, and indefiniteness or mysteriousness, especially in the conclusion. The separate parts of the poem are introduced by lyrical poetic overtures, including nature themes, and these overtures set the locale and atmosphere. The poem has its usual cast of characters, consisting of (1) a hero, Titanic or disillusioned or both, (2) an ethereally idealized heroine, and (3) the "type of the pasha," who is the obstacle to the happiness of the hero and heroine. Exoticism of setting is combined with melodramatic themes of romantic banditry and the harem. The style is elevated and lyrical, and it makes liberal use of the rhetorical question, the exclamation, and of the author's speaking to or of the characters, usually the hero, in the tone and from the point of view of the characters. Pushkin adopted almost all these qualities, and they became conventions in the Russian romantic verse tale; Pushkin, however, modifies these qualities by taking the hero away from the center of interest and by giving more space to the heroine, by lowering the elevated, argumentative, and lyrical style, and by removing the more Titanic traits of the hero's character.

As Zhirmunsky notes, only one Russian poet other than Pushkin materially influenced the further development of the genre of the romantic verse tale in Russian. The "confession" was introduced into Russian poetry by Ivan Ivanovich Kozlov, who adapted, sentimentalized, and softened the final part of Byron's Giaour in

his own Monk (Chernets, 1825). In addition, there was some influence upon the further development of the genre of the Russian romantic verse tale by outstanding translations from Byron into Russian at the time. All of Byron's Oriental tales were available to the Russian reader or poet in numerous editions in English, in numerous French translations, and in Russian prose translations; there were two significant Russian poetic translations from Byron during the time of the great popularity of the romantic verse tale, Kozlov's translation (1826) of Byron's Bride of Abydos, and the translation (w. 1821, p. 1822) of The Prisoner of Chillon by the great Russian poet-translator Vasily Andreevich Zhukovsky. Byron's Prisoner of Chillon (1816) is not an Oriental tale in form, tone, or themes, but there is an admixture of influence of it in some Russian romantic verse tales, largely perhaps as a result of Zhukovsky's translation.[9]

Perhaps the single most important theoretical contribution in Zhirmunsky's formal analysis is with regard to what he calls "composition," understood as in painting—the way the component ingredients of a work of art are distributed and combined. Though practically all the individual ingredients, poetic devices, and even themes, characterizations, and locales of the Byronic poem can be found in separate works of various authors preceding Byron's Oriental tales, Zhirmunsky shows that Byron put them together into a characteristic amalgam which was original in form and effect. Zhirmunsky convincingly argues that after it has been established that Pushkin borrowed from Byron the basic form of the Byronic poem, borrowing from Byron is also indicated in the themes and techniques used, when they are employed as Byron uses them, even though individually they may be found elsewhere. Similarly, we shall be able to isolate debts of Lermontov directly to Byron when he uses Byronic materials and methods for a Byronic purpose in a way different from his other predecessors. Since Lermontov's verse tales come at the end of the Russian tradition of the genre, it is not surprising that it is often impossible to tell which influence is direct and which is indirect.

When The Mtsyri appeared, Lermontov had already written almost thirty romantic verse tales or "fragments," and he had been working on the materials of this poem intermittently for ten years. Lermontov's work on his verse tales covers his entire period of poetic activity, from his first schoolboy versifying in 1828, when he was only fourteen, to the year of his death, 1841. Lermontov's first two years of work in the genre of the verse tale (1828-30) may be called his "Pushkin period" in it, for he more or

less systematically went down the list of Pushkin's romantic verse tales and imitated or adapted each of them.[10] Even in these early adaptations, there is an admixture of other elements, including some borrowings from Byron, mainly in Russian translations. By the middle of 1830 Lermontov had learned English,[11] and now having exhausted for his purposes Pushkin's poems in the genre of the romantic verse tale, Lermontov went directly to Byron. Lermontov's second period in the genre (1830-36), still an immature period but showing remarkable advance over the first one, may be aptly called his "Byron period" in it, for Lermontov goes directly to Byron for precisely the features of the Oriental tales which Pushkin had not adopted. Even at this early time, Lermontov shows attempts at originality in forming new combinations of the elements of the romantic verse tale; no longer is there a slavish following of a single work as source. In this period materials are borrowed from various poems and authors, but the pervading influence and manner is that of Byron. The romantic verse tales of Lermontov's mature period (1836-41) all utilize materials going back from seven to twelve years in his own poetic work, to his earlier, immature periods.

It is always interesting to trace how a literary masterpiece has been composed, when the artist has left us materials for reconstructing and evaluating his progress from the first dawning of the initial idea to the finished work. Lermontov's odd method of writing his major works has often been commented upon; during the course of his brief creative life, he customarily worked over materials, images, lines, passages, comparisons, themes, characterizations, and plots, which he had given a literary setting during his boyhood or early university years, and then gave them a final form and setting in one of the major works of his mature years.[12] Lermontov's three romantic verse tales of his mature period, The Mtsyri, The Fugitive, and The Demon, the first two of which were written as we have noted in 1839 and the final version of the last in 1841, utilize materials going back to 1830, 1831, and 1829, respectively; the first two of these are each culminations of a series of three poems; eight different versions of The Demon exist, and it is not certain that Lermontov was satisfied even with the last one.

The Mtsyri utilizes themes, images, the versification, the main situation, and even lines taken verbatim or almost verbatim from two of his earlier verse tales, The Confession (Ispoved', w. 1830) and The Boyar Orsha (Boiarin Orsha, w. 1835-36).[13] The inter-relationship among these three poems has been noted,

but the question has not been studied in sufficient detail, particularly in connection with the literary origins of the three poems. It will be the purpose of this paper to study The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri in terms of their literary debts and antecedents, with emphasis upon their debts directly and indirectly to Byron. The literary antecedents of the chief points of contact of the three poems will first be discussed, and then the three poems will be studied in the order of their composition.

The first broad point of contact among The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri is their versification. All three poems are immediately worthy of note in Russian versification in that they all have all-masculine rhymes (the meter of the poems, iambic tetrameter, was usual after Pushkin for the Russian romantic verse tale). Russian versification has traditionally followed the French in expecting the alternation of masculine and feminine rhymes, and Lermontov's use of all-masculine rhymes at once calls attention to the only narrative poems which up to that time had appeared in Russian in that form, Zhukovsky's translation of Byron's Prisoner of Chillon, and The Beggar (Nishchii, 1830) by the minor poet Andrey Ivanovich Podolinsky. When Lermontov's Mtsyri appeared, his critics, who could not then know of his two earlier poems in this series, immediately found the versification of The Mtsyri reminiscent of that of Zhukovsky's translation of Byron's Prisoner of Chillon. Zhukovsky's innovation in Russian versification resulted from his merely following the rhymes of Byron's poem, which, like almost all English rhymed poetry, has preponderantly masculine rhymes. Lermontov had already borrowed some phrases from Zhukovsky's translation of The Prisoner of Chillon before 1830,[14] and hence he did not need Podolinsky's poem to call his attention to its versification, though to be sure that may have helped. It should be added that in 1830 Lermontov had already written two romantic verse tales, Giulio (Dzhulio) and The Last Son of Freedom (Poslednii syn vol'nosti), in all-masculine iambic pentameter couplets, in versification obviously under the direct influence of Byron, or of English prosody as Lermontov had seen it in Byron. It is clear that the all-masculine iambic tetrameter versification of The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri is indebted to Byron either directly or indirectly (through Zhikovsky or possibly through Podolinsky and then Zhikovsky). Of these alternatives, the most likely seems to be that Lermontov is indebted to Byron through Zhukovsky in this respect, though it seems quite probable that he might have written in all-masculine tetrameters in 1830, even if Zhukovsky has not used the form. Lermontov

had already consciously followed Byron is using all-masculine rhymes, and there can be no doubt that Lermontov associated all-masculine rhymes with Byron. Thus the versification of Lermontov's three poems culminating in The Mtsyri is connected with Byron's Prisoner of Chillon, a point which we shall find to be of some importance with regard to their contents.

Just as the versification of the three poems culminating in The Mtsyri goes back to Byron directly or through one or two intermediaries, the basic situation in common among the three poems also goes back to Byron, both directly and through an intermediary. The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri have as their second basic similarity that all, within the genre of the romantic verse tale, have as their center the hero's pre-death confession in a monastery.

The Russian poems of pre-death monastery confession go back to Byron's Giaour, which in its final part gives the hero's fragmentary, unclear, defiant, unrepentant self-justification in the form of a voluntary pre-death confession. As we have seen, Kozlov introduced the confession into Russian poetry with his Monk, which is an imitation of Byron's Giaour, but with most of the specifically Byronic qualities of the confession removed, including the pride, defiance, lack of repentance, fragmentariness, and most of the mysteriousness. As we shall see, Lermontov follows Kozlov where-in Kozlov follows Byron; Lermontov markedly differs from Kozlov in that he puts back into the confession the qualities which Kozlov had removed from it.

Byron allows the hero to give his confession in various other poems and manners, each of which has its importance with regard to one or more of these three poems by Lermontov: in the center of Parisina, where the hero is on trial for his life because of a forbidden love; as a long monolog in The Bride of Abydos, when the hero reveals to the heroine and the reader his identity and much with regard to his character; for the recountal of the central adventure of Mazeppa. The form of the "confession" or dramatic monolog without narrative framework is used in The Prisoner of Chillon, which has some points of contact with the Oriental tales, but which is basically different in plot, themes, cast of characters, setting, the character of the hero, the use of nature description, and in general tone.

Thus, like their versification, the basic form of these poems goes back to Byron directly or through one or more intermediaries. The genre of the romantic verse tale itself goes back to Byron, but there were hundreds of Russian romantic verse tales before Lermontov wrote his. The "confession" in the Russian

romantic verse tale also goes back to Byron, and Lermontov is indebted to several different poems of Byron's in which the confession is used. The hero's pre-death monastery confession, which is the central scene in each of the three poems in the series ending with The Mtsyri, goes back to Byron's Giaour directly and also through one intermediary, Kozlov's Monk.

All three of Lermontov's monastery-confession poems are similar to each other and quite different from anything else in the Russian tradition—while at the same time similar to Byron's poems—in the tone and themes of the confession. Instead of the simple chronological narration of events or of a logical and topical confession, the hero's confession becomes a compulsive, abrupt, fragmentary, defiant, unclear self-defense. The framework in which this confession is given varies in the three poems, and these frameworks have different literary antecedents, but the basic tone and many of the themes of the confession remain identical and come directly from Byron. Lermontov was building upon the Byronic tradition of the genre of the Russian romantic verse tale and of the confession within it, but in order to give the poems the tone and themes he wished, he went directly to Byron.

Russian critics have felt that in The Confession, written in 1830 when Lermontov was only sixteen, he achieved the tone which in Russian poetry belongs peculiarly to him.[15] The Confession, with only 226 lines, is the shortest of Lermontov's narrative poems. The center of interest is not the narrative framework or the plot, which comes out indirectly from the hero's confession, but the fragmentary, defiant, self-justifying confession itself. The framework of The Confession was taken directly from Kozlov's Monk; it consists of a preliminary description of the monastery setting and then of the father-confessor and the young dying monk, followed by the central confession of the hero, and concluding with a lyric description of the tolling of the monastery bell upon the death of the hero. Kozlov had taken the description of the monastery setting, the father-confessor, and the young dying monk from Byron's Giaour, and he had borrowed the tolling of the bell from Sir Walter Scott's Marmion (II, xxxiii). Lermontov adapted his plot elements mainly from this same scene in Marmion.[16] Lermontov follows Scott in the following plot details: the central character is under trial before the Inquisition for having broken monastic vows and having had illicit sexual relationships; after a defiant speech, the central character is executed, and the sound of a bell announces to the outside world that a death has occurred. Lermontov changes Scott's "confessing" heroine to a hero, and the one illicitly loved becomes a

nun instead of the warrior Marmion. The effect of the sound of the bell is handled differently by Lermontov than by Scott or Kozlov; instead of providing a lyrical conclusion for the scene, the sound of the bell conveys to the nun the news of the death of the hero, whereupon she shrieks and dies. Thus there is considerable debt to Scott in the materials of The Confession. However, here as elsewhere when Lermontov borrows plot materials from Scott, his debt to Scott is limited almost completely to the simple borrowing of materials; the themes and tone and manner of the confession are directly indebted to Byron's Giaour. It may also be noted that the whole scene of the defiant prisoner, before his priest-judge, defending his illicit love, both in The Confession and in The Boyar Orsha are reminiscent of the scene of Hugo's defiant confession in the presence of his father-judge in Byron's Parisina.[17]

Though the framework and plot elements are largely taken from others, as we have seen, the disconnected, argumentative, defiant nature of the hero's confession itself, which forms the center of the poem, is indebted directly to Byron's Giaour. As in The Giaour, the events of the hero's life are revealed indirectly and incoherently, and mysteriousness is preserved with regard to the hero's identity and the actions which make up much of the background of the poem. The hero's confession, like that of the hero of The Giaour, is rather an impassioned self-defense than a logical or chronological account or any admission of wrongdoing. The hero's pride, defiance, and lack of repentance are combined with an extreme attitude toward human passions and human love. The intensity of his love "justifies" it, regardless of the laws of man or church (lines 73-82; cf. The Giaour, lines 1131-44); a moment's experience of such love is better than a lifetime without it; the hero does not want even paradise without the loved one (lines 140-155; cf. The Bride of Abydos, II, 109-13.). There are debts to The Prisoner of Chillon in the hero's love of liberty and hatred of imprisonment, and also in the image of the free bird to contrast with the hero's imprisonment and the hero's feeling of rapture as he sees and describes the bird (lines 53-60; Prisoner of Chillon, lines 251-299);[18] like the Prisoner of Chillon's brother (lines 164-175), he is a flower dying in prison air (lines 162-173).

The other two characters play little direct part in the poem. The heroine appears only in the final scene, when, hearing the bell tolling the hero's death, she shrieks and dies (lines 219-226). Lermontov is here following the Byronic tradition of Parisina (lines 347-349, 498-501) and of The Bride of Abydos (lines 632-639);[19]

Byron's heroines live only in their love for the hero, and when the hero dies or is thought to have died, the heroine dies outright.[20] The father confessor in Lermontov's poem, as in Byron's Giaour and in Kozlov's Monk (which follows Byron in this regard) plays little part in the poem, except for providing an auditor for the hero. The hero contrasts his own youth and inexperience with the father confessor's age and experience (lines 49-54, 61-66; The Giaour, lines 971-976; The Monk, lines 201-204); the confession itself becomes a dramatic monolog in that the father confessor's reactions to the hero's words are reflected in the hero's confession (lines 95-96, 162; The Giaour, lines 1036, 1161, 1202, 1209).

Within the space at my disposal I shall not be able to show the great similarity in style and tone between Lermontov's poem and Byron's Oriental tales, especially The Giaour. Stylistic analysis would show that, just as Pushkin had removed much of the Byronic quality from the style as well as the treatment of the hero in the romantic verse tale, Lermontov restores these qualities in style as well as Byronic attitudes and themes.

Five years after The Confession, Lermontov in The Boyar Orsha (1835-36), the last of his verse tales before his mature period, returns to the materials and verse form of The Confession. He greatly augments the story materials, as he increases the length of the poem from 226 to 1065 lines. Lermontov shifts the locale of the poem from Spain of the Middle Ages to Russia and the Lithuanian border and the time to that of Ivan the Terrible. (For The Mtsyri, he shifts the place to Caucasian Georgia and the time to almost contemporary days.) The pre-death monastery confession is central in The Boyar Orsha just as in The Confession, but it comprises only one-third instead of four-fifths of the poem—just as the hero's pre-death confession occupies the central third of Byron's Parisina and the final third of The Giaour. The additional materials which Lermontov uses to triple the length of his earlier poem are also taken mainly from Byron; The Boyar Orsha as a whole is the closest to Byron's Oriental tales of all Lermontov's poems and thereby of all narrative poems in the Russian language. In addition to the materials which he takes over from The Confession and re-uses in The Boyar Orsha, there are new and significant borrowings from Byron, mainly from The Bride of Abydos, but also from Parisina, The Giaour, Mazeppa, and Childe Harold.

Lermontov took the chief characters and their inter-relationships for The Boyar Orsha directly from Byron's Bride of Abydos. Lermontov's three chief characters are the typical Byronic triangle

of The Bride of Abydos, the hero and heroine who love each other, and the "obstacle," the heroine's father, who prevents the happiness of the two lovers. The plot of the first part of The Boyar Orsha is indebted to The Bride of Abydos in the following details: the hero, whose ancestry is unclear, has been brought up by the heroine's father; the hero and heroine, growing up together, have fallen in love with each other; the hero has become the leader of a bandit gang; the hero is about to attempt to elope with the heroine, with the aid of his bandit gang, but he pauses to tell her of his plans; the heroine's father intervenes, with the result that the heroine dies. Not only does Lermontov borrow these plot details and inter-relationships from The Bride of Abydos, but he is also greatly indebted to Byron in their use. Perhaps the greatest of these debts is in a scene in which the hero tells the heroine of his love for her, of the existence of the bandit group, and of his plans for them (lines 204-230), a scene greatly reminiscent of the long scene in which the hero of Byron's Bride of Abydos tells the heroine of his love for her and of his plans of escape with her (II, 184, 490).

Arseny, the hero of The Boyar Orsha (unlike the hero of The Bride of Abydos), is captured, and he survives to stand trial for his "crimes." This trial is presented in part two of the poem. The trial is nominally of the hero as a leader of the bandits, but it is also connected with the forbidden love of the hero and heroine, as in Byron's Parisina, and as in Parisina the "obstacle" (here the heroine's father, Orsha) is the chief accuser. In the confession itself, which is the center and comprises practically all of part two, there is a re-use of the confessional themes which Lermontov had already used in The Confession, and a borrowing of lines and whole passages embodying them. The hero's self-defense is again fragmentary and unclear; it is full of pride and defiance; and it is devoid of repentance for any crime. The intensity of his love for the heroine is again emphasized; his passion is "justified" by its intensity. The hero's love of nature is again symbolized in the image of the bird (lines 605-611). The hero also recounts an experience when he was once "free," when he "flees" from his "imprisonment" and is able to see and enjoy nature for the first time (lines 508-533); this experience is adapted from the hero's monolog in The Bride of Abydos (II, 343-352). But perhaps the main importance of this passage is that, after being used in The Mtsyri to describe the hero's experience in general terms (lines 225-240), it suggested the detailed recountal of the events which took place during the hero's flight from the monastery and thus was expanded into the

major portion of The Mtsyri. The single most striking and perhaps most important part of this passage is that of the hero's friendship with the storm (lines 516-533), which is indebted to the famous storm passage in Childe Harold (III, 869-872): Lermontov is the only Russian poet who like Byron depicts the rapture of being in the storm.[21] In The Boyar Orsha this rapture goes to the point of the hero's desire for oblivion, to be swept away by the storm; it is noteworthy that when Lermontov transplanted this passage into The Mtsyri, this desire for oblivion is removed (lines 233b-234 of The Mtsyri replace lines 521b-527 of The Boyar Orsha). At the end of the second part of the poem, it develops that the confession was only apparently pre-death, for the prisoner escapes, with the aid of his fellow-bandits. The second part ends with a description of the river bank on the morning after the hero's escape (lines 674-681), a description indebted in method and details (the sand with footmarks, a broken weapon, a torn garment) to the description of the shore on the morning after the hero's attempted escape in The Bride of Abydos (II, 586-596).

The plot of part three of The Boyar Orsha is not taken directly from Byron, but it is full of debts to Byronic themes and poems. Arseny, the hero, is now fighting with the Lithuanians against the Russians; he discovers the dying Orsha, who has been fighting on the Russian side. Orsha tells Arseny that his daughter is awaiting her lover; Arseny returns and discovers her corpse, locked in the room where he had left her. The poem ends with the hero beginning goalless wandering in search of forgetfulness. Several whole scenes of this third part of the poem are heavily indebted to Byron. The scene of the death of Orsha, with the hero Arseny standing over him and watching him die (lines 834-839, 868-901) is greatly indebted in matter and manner to the scene of the Giaour watching his enemy Hassan die (lines 1080-1098). The scene of the hero's ride from the field of battle to Orsha's castle (lines 912-934) has obvious debts to the wild ride in Mazeppa (lines 423-794), in the themes of the wild gallop, the forest, the buzzard, and the wolves. And it is worthy of mention that the geographical locations of Arseny's ride and of Mazeppa's ride are very close together. Byron presents no scene so horrible as Lermontov's description of skeleton of the heroine, with a serpent crawling among its bones (lines 1009-1020), but even here Lermontov is indebted to Byron, as he gives a concrete presentation of an image which Byron uses to depict the intensity of the hero's remorse.[22] There is also a reminiscence of the theme of the appearance of the ghost of the heroine to the hero in a dream (lines 560-573), which Byron used as

the hero of The Giaour is about to die (lines 1257-1318), and which Kozlov had used in The Monk. The theme of the hero's goalless wandering for the purpose of trying to forget occurs in Byron in The Giaour and at the very end of The Corsair; Kozlov and other Russian poets had used this theme, and Lermontov himself, in earlier poems. The use of this theme to conclude the poem is however a direct compositional debt to Byron's Corsair.

Numerous other important points in The Boyar Orsha show connection with Byron. Each of the three parts has an epigraph from Byron, and each epigraph, as is usual in Lermontov's romantic verse tales, points to important relationships. The epigraph to the first part, the heroine's dying shriek in Parisina, shows that this scene here, and also in The Confession, is indebted to Parisina.[23] The other two epigraphs relate to the hero. The epigraph to the second part of the poet, emphasizing the hero's sins, woes, and impenitence, is taken from The Giaour (lines 1200-1202), and it underlines the connections between the unrepentant confessions of Lermontov's three poems of pre-death monastery confession and Byron's Giaour. The epigraph to the third part of the poem is concerned with the hero's appearance, his pale brow as he is filled with remorse and hopelessness; this epigraph is also taken from Byron's Giaour (lines 610-611), and it affirms Lermontov's obligations to Byron in the appearance of his heroes as well as in their other characteristics.

The Boyar Orsha is the only one of the three poems in the series ending with The Mtsyri in which the appearance of the hero is emphasized. Numerous scenes and details are directly connected with Byron's manner of presenting his heroes. Byron likes to present his heroes in striking manner or "pose," and to emphasize particular facial features. Outstanding "pose" descriptions include such things as Lara leaning against a pillar in a hall (Lara, I, 397-401), Lara standing over the felled Ezzelin (II, 73-78), the "rider" pose in The Giaour (lines 180-276), the Giaour raving on the cliff (lines 822-831), the Giaour standing over the fallen Hassan (lines 655-674); many more could be listed.[24] In The Boyar Orsha "pose" descriptions depending upon Byron include the description of the hero leaning against a column and concealing his emotions (lines 349-357; compare Lara, I, 397 ff.); Arseny stands over Orsha and watches him die (lines 835-889); Orsha looks back at the window of his daughter's room, as he departs for war (lines 734-41), reminiscent of the hero of The Corsair looking back as he leaves for a bandit raid (I, 578-82).[25] In the description of the features of the hero there is also much debt to Byron: he has an "evil eye"

and a "pale forehead where crime and evil have left their stamp" (lines 820-824; cf. The Giaour, lines 196, 612); his smile is like a serpent's (lines 827-828; cf. The Giaour, lines 832-860, and Manfred, I, 236-241); his face is pale, his garb is foreign (line 955; The Giaour, line 231). Many other themes relating to the hero are connected with Byron or the tradition springing from him, including the hero as bandit and leader of a robber band, the theme of "traitor" (line 837; cf. The Siege of Corinth, etc.) as the hero fights against his erstwhile country, the hero's anguish (compared with a serpent in the hero's bosom—a Byronic image—in lines 849-851; cf. The Giaour, lines 945-950). Other particular themes from The Bride of Abydos include the hero not being what he appears (lines 212-213; Bride of Abydos, lines 151-164), and his being contemptuously addressed by the heroine's father as "foundling, disdained slave, and an orphan" (lines 475-476; cf. Bride of Abydos, I, 81-82, 111, 363-364). Other themes of the hero's defiance, will-power, and the intensity of his love are repeated from The Confession.

The heroine of The Boyar Orsha, as usual in Byronic poems, lives only in and for her love for the hero. The scene of her death is indebted, as we have seen, to the death of the heroine of The Bride of Abydos in the plot structure of the poem, and verbally to that of the heroine of Parisina. There is also a verbal debt to Kozlov's translation of Byron's Bride of Abydos in the final description of the corpse of the heroine.[26] It may be noted that to describe the heroine Lermontov uses a developed image of a tree growing among ruins (lines 43-54), an image which he adopts from his own Lithuanian Girl (Litvinka, 1830; lines 511-524), for which poem the image was borrowed from Byron's Childe Harold (IV, xx).

Orsha, the "obstacle," as is typical in Byron's peoms, shares some of the characteristics of the hero. It is curious that he shares one of the chief characteristics of heroes of Byronic poems, disillusionment with society (lines 168-172; cf. especially The Corsair, I, 251-260), a trait which is foreign to all three heroes of Lermontov's poems of monastery confession, but one common to the heroes of many of Pushkin's and Lermontov's verse tales. Like Byron's and Lermontov's heroes, Orsha has a forehead covered with wrinkles (line 163). Like Byron's heroes, he has great will-power and self-control; however, in a moment of abstraction, his face may show his emotions, as "shades of black thoughts cross his face" (lines 163-165). As we have seen, Lermontov gives him pose descriptions similar to those of Byronic heroes in his riding away from home and

also in his death scene. His hatred (line 889), like that of Byron's Hassan, continues even beyond death.

There is one indication of Lermontov's groping for originality in The Boyar Orsha. In this poem Lermontov follows Byron and the tradition which Pushkin had instituted in Russia following Byron's verse tales, in using lyrical descriptive overtures or introductions to each of the three parts of the poem. But these overtures in this poem are not thematically or stylistically indebted to Byron. The first uses folklore material and stylization (somewhat in the spirit of the Russian folk-epic bylina); the other two are more concretely realistic and depictive than any of Byron's descriptive overtures.

However, with this exception, there is little in The Boyar Orsha that is new or particularly original in form or effect, in comparison with Byron's own use of the form, though there is much that had not appeared in Russian. Almost everything in the poem is Byronic and shows direct influence of or borrowing from Byron. Lermontov's debts to Byron are, however, not to one poem but to a number of poems, and the effect is that of ease within the poetic tradition. Lermontov had mastered the themes of the genre, and even when he combines a great number of obvious debts to Byron with a great amount of influence from him, the poem itself comes out as something independent. The poem gives a new combination of its Byronic themes and methods, and in its genre it is one of considerable power. It ranks, among Lermontov's verse tales, only behind the three poems of Lermontov's mature period, and perhaps Izmail Bei (1832). Its moving power is that of Byron's Oriental poems—the unblushing melodrama of character portrayal, situations, and actions, and the poet's (and assumedly the reader's) admiration for the mysterious, powerful, passionate, and "criminal" hero, powerful in war and in love, whose "criminality" is "justified" by the intensity of his passions, especially of his love and of his revolt against the surrounding milieu which prevents his self-realization and his happiness.

No Russian poet has ever been so demanding of himself in choosing his works for publication as Lermontov—he omitted from his collected short poems some of his works which have since been best loved and most admired;[27] The Mtsyri was the only one of his verse tales which he himself published.[28] The Mtsyri continues the versification of The Confession and The Boyar Orsha, and also their central proud, defiant, pre-death monastery confession. The title The Mtsyri offers obvious points of contact with Kozlov's Monk and Byron's Giaour: the Georgian word "mtsyri" means a novice in a monastery, and its connection with Kozlov's Monk is obvious; the use of an exotic title in a foreign language,

as applying to the hero, is an obvious point of contact and of debt within the tradition, with Byron's Giaour (the Moslem word for a non-Moslem). Between the time of the composition of The Boyar Orsha and The Mtsyri Lermontov's first exile to the Caucasus had intervened; Lermontov now shifts the site of the poem to Caucasian Georgia, and he thus give motivation for the magnificent descriptions of mountain grandeur which make up perhaps the best part of the poem. In Lermontov's two previous poems of monastery confession, the story of the love of the hero and heroine is central; in The Mtsyri this theme is almost completely supplanted by that of the love of native land (an un-Byronic theme) and the desire to return to it.

For the story of The Mtsyri, Lermontov departs far from the mysterious blood and thunder of the Byronic Oriental tales and from his own two previous monastery confessions. The story of The Mtsyri is simple, straightforward, and original, and it is based apparently upon an actual event. A native of the Caucasian mountains, taken prisoner by the Russians as a child, has been brought up in a monastery in Caucasian Georgia. After attaining mature years, he runs away one night and tries to return to his native land, far up in the mountains. On the way he experiences communion with nature, he feels the first stirrings of human love (or the possibility of it), and he discovers his physical prowess, as he has to engage in unarmed combat with a mountain lion. After his victorious battle with the mountain lion, gravely wounded, he becomes faint, loses consciousness, and has a delirious dream. He hears the monastery bell; he is found and brought back to the monastery. There, dying, he gives his last confession.

Of the story details, few are related to the Byronic tradition. We have seen that the themes of the captured boy, brought up in "imprisonment," who tries to "escape," and who while free feels rapture and enjoys nature—themes which Lermontov had used in The Boyar Orsha—go back in the romantic verse tale to Byron's Bride of Abydos.

The structure of the poem has points of interest with respect to the Byronic tradition. The poem consists structurally of a comparatively short introduction and then the hero's long confession. The introduction includes a lyrical overture (lines 1-26) and then expository material and stage-setting for the confession (lines 26-75). The lyrical overture to the romantic verse tale was, as we have seen, conventional; Lermontov has a point of apparently direct contact with Byron's Giaour (lines 288-351) in that the overture here is a lyrical description of ruins.[29] The second part of the

introduction is unlike the Oriental tales of Byron in that it gives a brief, clear, consecutive exposition of the events preceding the action of the poem (lines 27-75)—Byron preferred for the events to come out indirectly and in an unclear fashion during the confession itself, and Lermontov had followed him in this matter in The Confession and in The Boyar Orsha. Only in Mazeppa and The Prisoner of Chillon does Byron give such a clear, chronological account.

The hero's confession in The Mtsyri consists of four parts. The first, the most Byronic part (lines 76-149), is the hero's defiant, unconsecutive, proud self-defense in general terms, utilizing mainly the themes which Lermontov had already used in The Confession and The Boyar Orsha. Next the hero describes in general terms what he "saw" and "did" while he was at liberty (lines 150-240); this section contains a further development of the theme and section which Lermontov had adapted for The Boyar Orsha from The Bride of Abydos of the temporarily freed "prisoner's" rapture at seeing natural grandeur, and the section repeats the theme of the hero's being a "brother with the storm." The confession continues with its third and longest part (lines 241-695), a consecutive recountal of what the hero did while he was free. Four events stand out: He sees a mountain girl and falls in love with her, though she does not see him; he has a battle with a mountain lion; wounded, he has a "pre-death delirium," in which he dreams that he is at the bottom of a stream and that a mermaid is making love to him; he hears the monastery bells, and he is found and taken back to the monastery. The final part of the poem is lyric in tone: after reaffirming his wish to return to his native land, the hero asks to be taken into the monastery garden so that as he dies the breeze from the Caucasus can cool his forehead (lines 696-748).

Two whole scenes of The Mtsyri are reminiscent of and indebted to the tradition of the conclusion of The Giaour, though Lermontov gives each of them an independent and original development. Byron concludes The Giaour on a lyrical tone, with the hero's vision of the dead loved one (lines 1257-1318); Kozlov borrows the same scene for The Monk. As we have seen, Lermontov echoes this scene in The Boyar Orsha. The Byronic pre-death vision of the loved one is echoed in The Mtsyri (lines 647-695) first in the wounded hero's vision, which he calls a "pre-death delirium" (lines 647, 694), after his victorious battle with the mountain lion. However, the details of the vision do not come from the Byronic tradition. The hero, before his battle with the mountain lion, has seen and fallen in love with the Georgian girl; after the battle, he is weak and insatiably thirsty. The themes of love and thirst are combined in the hero's

delirium: he imagines he is at the bottom of a mountain stream, drinking in the icy water, as a mermaid sings of love for him. The theme of the mermaid was completely new in the Byronic romantic verse tale, though it had its own history in narrative and lyrical poetry of the time, including Lermontov's lyrics.

The lyrical conclusion of The Mtsyri (lines 725-748) is also indebted to the concluding vision of the loved one at the end of Byron's Giaour. In the final words of the poem, the hero expresses the wish that, as he dies, he will be taken into the monastery garden, where the breeze from his native mountains will be to him as the hand of a friend or brother in his native land, wiping the cold sweat from his forehead as he dies. It has apparently never before been noted that here we have a new development of the final part of The Giaour: not only the lyric conclusion, but the theme of the ghost of the loved one appearing to the hero as he dies and caressing his face with cool fingers--the breeze from the hero's native land is to him as the fingers of his dead (unrealizable) loved one stroking his dying brow. Lermontov's critics, especially Soviet critics, have sometimes objected that the hero modifies his defiant attitude at the end of the poem;[30] it should however be noted that the desire of the hero, who knows that he will die anyway, to experience this mark of affection of the loved one while he is dying, is by no means in Lermontov or Byron a rejection of the hero's earlier attitudes. In The Mtsyri it acts rather as a strengthening of the theme of the hero's intense love for his native land. Though the theme of human love exists in the poem, it is much less powerful than the theme of the hero's love for his native land; the Byronic theme of the hero's not desiring paradise without the loved one is changed slightly to the hero's willingness to give up "paradise and eternity" for a "fes moments" in his native land. Perhaps nothing about The Mtsyri is more original than this completely assimilated and transmuted theme, preserving its compositional function of giving a lyrical conclusion to the poem; love of native land in Lermontov's poem becomes as all-encompassing as love of woman had been in Byron's Giaour and other poems, and in Lermontov's earlier verse tales.

The hero occupies the complete center of The Mtsyri, just as in Lermontov's Confession and The Boyar Orsha, and his character-traits are largely the same as those of the heroes of those poems. It is easy to see why Lermontov's contemporaries, reading The Mtsyri as the only one of his romantic verse tales published by him, immediately thought of Byron. The hero possesses the typical Byronic qualities which Lermontov's Russian predecessors had excluded from their romantic verse tales, but which Lermontov as we

have seen had included, of pride, defiance, unrepentance, will-power. He is a "criminal" in breaking his monastery vows and trying to escape. The strength of a passion "justifies" it, and a moment of "life" is better than a lifetime of merely "existing." He proves himself a warrior. He is alone, an orphan, and young. He has been brought up, not by his parents, but in "imprisonment." He flees his "prison," and he feels rapture and communion with nature. He has almost all the qualities of the Byronic hero except that of leadership of men (he is more lonely even than Byron's heroes; there are no men for him to lead) and of disillusionment with society. (We have observed that none of the heroes of Lermontov's three poems of monastery confession shows such disillusionment: however, it is not always present in Byron, either—note The Giaour, The Bride of Abydos, and The Prisoner of Chillon, for example.) The Byronic themes of the hero's love of woman and of nature are both present, but Lermontov handles them differently than Byron, and they require further discussion.

We have already observed how the love theme is handled in The Mtsyri: instead of being central in the whole story, it enters into only one episode of the hero's flight from the monastery, and indirectly into another. The scene of his falling in love with the Georgian girl consists only in his seeing her go down the mountain side for water (lines 338-390); he is so moved upon seeing her that he faints. We have seen that the theme of love enters the poem again, in a distorted manner, in the hero's fainting vision of being at the bottom of a stream and of a mermaid making love to him. This handling of the love theme is quite different than in Byron. In the first place, Byron's heroes always enjoy requited love; the Georgian girl does not even know of the existence of the Mtsyri. The hero's fainting upon seeing the girl is also un-Byronic, as is also the theme of the mermaid.

The handling of nature-descriptions in the poem has interesting and rather complex connections with Byron. Lermontov repeats the passage from The Boyar Orsha of the hero's rapture with nature, when he is temporarily free, of the hero's rapture in the storm, and Lermontov is again indebted to The Prisoner of Chillon for the image of the free bird in contrast to the imprisoned hero, and for the image, newly and independently developed, of the prison flower.[31] However, the handling of physical nature is quite different in The Mtsyri from that in any preceding romantic verse tale, in its treatment and in the proportions given it in the poem. The chief interest and center of gravity of the poem is the chronological account of the hero's wanderings in scenes of mountain grandeur and of

his experiences while he wanders. The method of presentation of mountain grandeur, incidentally, goes back to the Byronic method, mainly that of Childe Harold, but also adumbrated in the poetic overtures to the verse tales—that of the presentation of natural grandeur as experienced by a powerful soul, rather than the simple presentation of plastic, concrete descriptions of definite scenes. (Pushkin had kept Byron's formally detachable use of nature descriptions when he adapted the basic form of the romantic verse tale from Byron, but his descriptions of mountain scenery in The Prisoner of the Caucasus are plastic presentations of particular scenes.)

At the same time Lermontov makes an important formal innovation in the romantic verse tale in his use of the nature descriptions here and in the last versions of his Demon: instead of formally detachable overtures as in Byron, or formally detachable plastic descriptions as in Pushkin, the descriptions which Lermontov's hero gives of mountain nature unfold naturally and organically from his account of what he saw and did while he was free; they are a part of the characterization of the hero and of the action of the poem. Lermontov had predecessors in this use of nature, again mainly Byron, in The Prisoner of Chillon and in Childe Harold, to which there are also debts in the hero's attitude toward nature. However, in the juxtaposition of methods of the Byronic Oriental verse tale, especially the defiant, unrepentant confession, with those of The Prisoner of Chillon and to some degree of the travelog-panorama Childe Harold, Lermontov produces something which is fresh, new, and different from anything which had preceded him. The connections between the attitude toward nature of Lermontov's hero (and Lermontov) and that of Byron, especially in Childe Harold, have often been noted. In the power of his nature descriptions, Lermontov does not yield however to anyone, whatever his debts. And Lermontov's general attitude toward nature in The Mtsyri is different from that of Byron; it is more primitive, in that the hero becomes as it were one of the lower animals, and thereby feels that he is in harmony with them and with nature, rather than rising above the "clogs" of the flesh and seeking union only with the more violent aspects of physical nature.[32]

One other scene of The Mtsyri may be mentioned in connection with Byron. Recent scholarship has shown that Lermontov was deeply indebted to Caucasian folklore in his presentation of the battle between the Mtsyri and the mountain lion.[33] There are also connections with the Byronic presentation of military scenes,

particularly the description of the hero watching his antagonist die (lines 513-521), a scene reminiscent in some ways to that of Arseny standing over Orsha in Lermontov's Boyar Orsha, itself indebted to Byron's Giaour.

The two other characters of the poem, the heroine and the father confessor, play no role of importance. The heroine appears in only one scene. She belongs to the tradition of the typical Byronic heroine, at once ethereal and voluptuous. One image with regard to her is indebted to Pushkin's Poltava. [34] The plastic description of her going down the mountain side for water, particularly in the detail of her stumbling and laughing at her own "clumsiness" (lines 356-357) is quite un-Byronic.

The father confessor in this poem, as in Byron's Giaour, Kozlov's Monk, and in Lermontov's Confession, plays only the role of auditor. In the hero's confession, we have indications of the father confessor's reaction to what the hero says, but the words of the father confessor are not given, and he does nothing in the poem but listen.

In tracing the genesis of The Mtsyri, we have been concerned with the literary origin of the materials in the three poems in the series ending with it, The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri itself. The basic genre of the romantic verse tale had been adapted into Russian by Pushkin from Byron's Oriental tales, and there were hundreds of poems in the genre when Lermontov began to write his romantic verse tales. The versification of Lermontov's three poems of monastery confession (iambic tetrameter with all-masculine rhymes) and the basic form (with a pre-death monastery confession as the central scene) go back to Byron, both directly and through at least one intermediary.

In Lermontov's first poem of monastery confession, The Confession, he achieves the tone which is peculiarly his in Russian narative poetry. This is accomplished through the use of Byronic versification in combination with peculiarly Byronic themes in the characterization of the hero— themes which Pushkin and Kozlov, Lermontov's chief predecessors in the Russian genre of the romantic verse tale, had omitted. These qualities are defiance, pride, lack of repentance, and courage, on the one hand, and love of nature and of liberty, on the other. The plot elements of The Confession are largely indebted to Sir Walter Scott's Marmion, and the framework of the poem to Kozlov's Monk, but the main part of the poem is the hero's confession, and the chief influence upon it is that of Byron.

In The Boyar Orsha, Lermontov keeps the indebtedness to Byron which he evidences in The Confession, and he adds other great debts in plot and in general form, mainly from The Bride of Abydos. One important Byronic trait is added in the hero's attitude toward nature, his rapture in the storm, and another is adumbrated, the recountal of the hero's experiences while he was temporarily free; the latter of these themes forms the germ for The Mtsyri. Practically everything in The Boyar Orsha comes directly from Byron or from the Byronic tradition, except certain poetic uses in the overtures to the various parts of the poem. Lermontov's indebtedness to Byron in theme, method, and characterization is underlined by the use of epigraphs from him. But Lermontov shows considerable freedom in the use of the borrowed themes and methods.

In The Mtsyri Lermontov, while continuing to show his earlier indebtedness to Byron in tone and theme of the confession and in continuing to use the general formal features of the Byronic verse tale, nevertheless introduces elements from other Byronic traditions (Childe Harold, The Prisoner of Chillon) in the handling of nature, and materials from other poetic traditions (Caucasus folklore, the mermaid theme), while he transmutes some of the Byronic elements used—to produce a poem which however much indebted to the spirit, themes, and methods of Byron, is quite different and independent. He makes the central theme of the poem the original theme of the hero's love of his native land and his overwhelming desire to return to it, and he subordinates to this theme the Byronic themes of love of woman and even of man's love of freedom and hatred of imprisonment. He adds original depictions of Caucasian landscape as seen through the eyes of a powerful hero, a point of contact with Childe Harold, to which there is debt, but originally and freshly developed. And he combines all this material into a new, organic, moving whole.

In the hero's proud, defiant, unrepentant confession, and in many particular themes and images, Lermontov remains Byronic, but he has developed to the point that he makes his borrowings completely his own, and he transmutes themes and methods so as to give new and original effects. And, a point I have not had the space to go into here, he has burned clear the often turgid and slovenly manner of the Byronic Oriental tale, and he has given sinews to the manner of The Prisoner of Chillon and a narrative core to that of Childe Harold, to produce perhaps the best romantic verse tale in any language, and certainly one of the finest poems in Russian.

Notes

1. This paper is based upon a chapter of my (unpublished) doctoral dissertation, "Byron and Lermontov: The Romantic Verse Tale," Harvard University, 1950. In a somewhat different form this paper was read before the Slavic Section of the annual convention of the Central States Modern Language Teachers' Association in Chicago, Illinois, in May 1951. Its publication has been delayed until this time by a two-year, second period of obligated military service.

2. A. D. Galakhov, "Lermontov," Russkii vestnik, XVI (1858), 60-92, 227-311, and 583-612; V. D. Spasovich, "Baironizm u Lermontova," Sochineniia (7 vols., Saint Petersburg, 1889-94), II, 343-406; N. P. Dashkevich, "Motivy mirovoi poezii v tvorchestve Lermontova," Stat'i po novoi russkoi literature (Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, XCII, Petrograd, 1914), pp. 411-514 (first published in 1892); A. Veselovskii, Zapadnoe vliianiia v novoi russkoi literature (2nd revised ed., Moscow, 1896), pp. 202-210; A. Veselovskii, "Etiudy o baironizme," Etiudy i kharakhteristiki (Moscow, 1907), pp. 541-63; M. Zdziechowski, Byron i jego wiek (2 vols., Krakowie, 1897), II, 274-365; N. A. Kotliarevskii, Mikhail Iur'evich Lermontov: Lichnost' poeta i ego proizvedeniia (3rd ed., Saint Petersburg, 1909); E. Duchesne, Michel Iourévitch Lermontov: Sa Vie et ses oeuvres (Paris, 1910); M. Rozanov, "Baironicheskie motivy v tvorchestve Lermontova," in Venok Lermontovu: Iubileinyi sbornik (Moscow, 1914); B. M. Eikhenbaum, Lermontov: Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki (Leningrad, 1924); E. J. Simmons, English Literature and Culture in Russia (1553-1840) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), pp. 269-309; A. Fedorov, "Tvorchestvo Lermontova i zapadnye literatury," in M. Iu. Lermontov, I (forms vols. XLIII-XLIV [1941] of Literaturnoe nasledstvo), 129-226; M. Nol'man, "Lermontov i Bairon," in Zhizn' i tvorchestvo M. Iu. Lermontova: Sbornik I: Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. N. L. Brodskii and others (Moscow, 1941), pp. 466-515; I. N. Rozanov, Lermontov: Master stikha (Moscow, 1942).

3. Studies of Lermontov's acknowledged translations from Byron, in Fedorov and I. N. Rozanov (see note 2) form a partial exception. "Byronism" in The Hero of Our Time is studied by William James Entwistle, "The Byronism of Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time," in Comparative Literature, I (1949), 140-146.

4. I use the chronology of the standard edition of Lermontov's works, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii M. Iu. Lermontova, ed. Boris Eikhenbaum (5 vols., Moscow, Leningrad: "Academia," 1935-37). All references in this paper to Lermontov's works are to this edition.

5. Viktor Zhirmunskii, Bairon i Pushkin: Iz istorii romanticheskoi poemy (Leningrad, 1924).

6. For a detailed account of the Russian Formalists—an apologia, with some correctives—see Victor Erlich, Russian Formalism: History—Doctrine ('S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1955); for Zhirmunsky, see Index. This book appeared while my article was already in the press.

7. Byron's Oriental tales, for the purposes of this classification, though some of them do not have Oriental settings, include The Giaour (1813), The Bride of Abydos (1813), The Corsair (1814), Lara (1814), The Siege of Corinth (1816), Parisina (1816), and Mazeppa (1818).

8. The completed poems include The Prisoner of the Caucasus (w. 1820-21, p. 1822), The Fountain of Bakhchisaray (Bakhchisaraiskii fontan, w. 1822, p. 1824), The Gipsies (Tsygany, w. 1823-24, p. 1827), and (the only partly Byronic) Poltava (Poltava, w. 1828, p. 1829). The two "fragments" are The Bandit Brothers (Brat'ia razboiniki, w. 1821, p. 1824) and Vadim (Vadim, w. 1821?, p. 1827).

9. Pushkin apparently felt that there was some influence of Byron's Prisoner of Chillon on his Bandit Brothers. In a letter to Vyazemsky (November 11, 1823), Pushkin notes that certain verses of The Bandit Brothers are reminiscent of Zhukovsky's translation of The Prisoner of Chillon, which he had not seen when he wrote the poem.

10. Lermontov's Prisoner of the Caucasus (Kavkazskii plennik, 1828), was a simple recasting of Pushkin's poem of the same name; Lermontov's Gipsies (Tsygany, 1829) was a fragmentary attempt to make Pushkin's Gipsies into an opera libretto; Lermontov's Two Captive Women (Dve nevol'nitsy, 1830), was a fragmentary attempt to rewrite Pushkin's Fountain of Bakhchisaray. Lermontov's Corsair (Korsar, 1828), though the title is borrowed from Byron, and also his Criminal (Prestupnik, 1829) are greatly indebted to Pushkin's Bandit Brothers; Lermontov's fragmentary Oleg was no doubt suggested by Pushkin's fragmentary Vadim. Thus Lermontov directly imitates, though with some admixture of other borrowings and influences, each of Pushkin's "Byronic" tales, with the exception of Poltava, in which the Byronic hero is treated as a villain. For more detailed discussion of Lermontov's "periods" in the romantic verse tale, see Shaw, pp. 64-70, and for the "Pushkin period," see pp. 76-110.

11. There has been disagreement as to when Lermontov learned English. For detailed discussion, see Shaw, pp. 434-462.

12. For a typical comment, see D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), p. 173.

13. A list of the passages which are identical or almost identical in two or three of these poems follows (the number of lines in the corresponding passages may vary slightly because of additions, omissions, or telescoping of lines):

The Confession	The Boyar Orsha	The Mtsyri
27-45	578-597	
45-66	597-618	128-149
67-68	434-435	76-77
69-72	437-439	81-84
	440-449	
	482-494	106-117
	512-533	225-240
84-85	548-549	
	552-554	443-445
125-139	450-466	
144-151	1042-1049	
153-155	1055-1057	
156-160	1050-1055	

14. See Shaw, pp. 96-97.

15. See, for example, S. Durylin, Kak rabotal Lermontov (Moscow, 1934), p. 65.

16. See Zhirmunsky, p. 296. Byron himself may have been indebted for the general idea of the defiant confession in The Giaour to this scene in Marmion (1808). For discussion of Lermontov's debt to Sir Walter Scott, see B. V. Neiman, "K voprosu ob istochnikakh poezii Lermontova," Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia, 1915, No. 4, pp. 282-289; and 1916, No. 3, pp. 80-89; and also D. P. Iakubovich, "Lermontov i Val'ter Skott," Izvestiia akademii nauk SSSR, Seriia 7, Otdelenie obshchestvennyk nauk, 1935, No. 3, pp. 243-72.

17. The scene of the heroine's dying shriek upon learning of the hero's death (see n. 19 below) shows that Lermontov had Parisina in mind.

18. Lermontov had already made use of this passage from The Prisoner of Chillon in his Corsair, lines 49-59; there are verbal debts there to Zhukovsky's translation of Byron's poem.

19. It is clear that Lermontov had the scene from Parisina in mind, for he uses a passage from it (lines 347-349) as epigraph for part one of his Boyar Orsha, where (lines 239-245) he repeats this scene and only slightly rewrites the passage. Lermontov's epigraphs almost always show significant relationships. Galakhov (p. 280) and Spasovich (II, 358-359) argue that Lermontov is directly indebted in these passages to Konrad Wallenrod (lines 1988-94), by the great Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz, who was himself indebted for this passage in his poem (1825) to this passage from Parisina, in that it is not absolutely clear in Byron whether the heroine dies

immediately after her shriek. The argument does not seem convincing, in view of Lermontov's use of the epigraph from Byron, though Lermontov very well may have known Mickiewicz's poem at this time. It may also be noted that the renegade nun shrieks and groans as she dies in Marmion, but the cause of her death is her execution by being walled up in the dungeon, rather than from learning of the death of the hero.

20. In The Bride of Abydos (Zuleika), Parisina (Parisina), The Corsair (Medora), Lara (Kaled), and Don Juan (Haidée).

21. This passage from Childe Harold had attracted Pushkin, and his Prisoner of the Caucasus felt "a sort of joy" as he sat on a mountain top and watched storms below him (I, 201-223). When Lermontov imitated Pushkin's poem in 1828—before he knew Byron—his hero, in the storm, was merely "wet all through, and he trembled all over" (line 419). Kozlov's Monk (lines 43-44) contains the unelaborated theme of the hero having gone out of the monastery once into the storm; the theme of the hero leaving the monastery is an adaptation of the passage of the Giaour leaving the monastery and raving on a cliff (lines 826-831).

22. The Bride of Abydos, II, 646-650; cf. The Giaour, lines 945-950. The latter passage was utilized by Lermontov for necrophilic images in several poems which he entitles "Night" ("Noch' I," "Noch' II," "Noch' III") and in "Death" ("Smert' "); these poems are indebted mainly, however, to Byron's "Darkness." Line 1020 of The Boyar Orsha is verbally indebted to Kozlov's translation (II, 831) of The Bride of Abydos passage cited above (pointed out in Eikhenbaum, Lermontov, pp. 72-73).

23. See discussion, p. 172, and note 19 above.

24. This discussion is indebted to Zhirmunsky, passim.

25. Here Lermontov is indebted to the same passages in Byron as in lines 1009-1020; see p. 175 and note 21. It is curious that Lermontov uses the image as Byron does, and also as the idea for a scene, in the same poem.

26. See above, p. 175 and note 22.

27. E.g., "The Sail" ("Parus") and "The Angel" ("Angel").

28. Lermontov was enraged when friends, without his consent, published his Hadji Abrek (Khadzhi Abrek, w. 1833-34) in 1835, even though it had some success. The censorship would not allow the publication of The Demon during Lermontov's lifetime.

29. Zhirmunsky, in studying the entire genre of the romantic verse tale in Russian with the exception of Lermontov's poems, points out that only one poem, the anonymous Doroshenko (1830) had used poetry of ruins. The passage in Doroshenko is obviously indebted formally and verbally to the passage in the Giaour. Lermontov seems to have no verbal debts to either Doroshenko or

The Giaour in this respect; there seems no reason to think that Lermontov noticed or remembered this poem. Lermontov himself used poetry of ruins in The Lithuanian Girl (Litvinka, 1830), The Aul Bastundzhi (1831), and in the final versions of The Demon (1838, 1841). There is a hint of it in The Boyar Orsha (lines 995-998) in the mention of the spider web in Orsha's abandoned house.

30. E. g., Durylin, p. 77.

31. Instead of withering because of its imprisonment, as in The Confession (see above, p. 172), this flower is so affected by its environment in prison, that when it is put into the sun, it withers and dies.

32. Lermontov's and Byron's attitudes toward nature might well be the subject of a separate study. Certain aspects of this subject are treated in M. Rozanov; however, he comes to the strange conclusion that Byron was a thoroughgoing pantheist, a follower of Spinoza, whereas Lermontov was merely a deist. Though there are pantheistic elements in some of Byron's works, the opposite of M. Rozanov's contentions seems nearer the truth, with regard to both Byron and Lermontov.

33. Iraklii Andronikov, Lermontov: Novye razyskaniia (Sovetskii pisatel', 1948), pp. 126-128.

34. The theme of the comparison of the girl's shapeliness with that of a poplar (lines 376-377) is from Poltava I, 20-21.

FIVE HUCUL HEALING INCANTATIONS

By Dov Neuman
Visiting Lecturer in Folklore, and
Teaching Associate in Slavic Studies at Indiana University

To the Huculs,[1] who have lived for centuries in an isolated area of the Eastern Carpathian Mountains, mainly in Pokucie (the southeastern region of Poland before World War II), but also in Rumanian Bukovina, in Hungary, and in eastern Czechoslovakia, life in its manifold aspects has always been pervaded by a multitude of mysterious evil forces. Magical beliefs and practices, probably going back to a remote past, are still widespread and deeply rooted among them. Strangely enough, many of the Hucul popular beliefs, tale-motifs, etc., are unknown to their Slavic neighbors, both to the Ukrainians, of whom the Huculs are ethnically and linguistically a part, and to the Poles, to whose dominating influence they have been exposed. This phenomenon of lack of conformity has not yet been adequately explained, in spite of comparatively intense collecting of Hucul folkloristic material and several good articles dealing with the rich Hucul demonology and magic.[2] There may be much in common between Hucul and Rumanian popular beliefs, all of them going back to early Byzantine influence,[3] but existing information is too scarce to confirm it.

The five incantations, which are published for the first time in this paper, my introductory remarks to them, and my references to parallels may shed additional light on the problem of Hucul-Rumanian relations without an attempt to solve it or to reach conclusions.

For the texts, collected during the 1930's by Mr. Leonid Bryliński and Mr. Petro Szekieryk-Donikiu, in and around Zhabie, "the capital of the Hucul-land," I am greatly indebted to my friend, the Polish scholar and author Dr. Stanisław De Vincenz, from our common native city of Kołomyja, the capital of Pokucie. I obtained the information for many of my introductory remarks during my high-school years there, and especially during my high-school summers spent in the Carpathian Mountains among the Huculs.

Diseases, like many other phenomena of life and nature, are attributed by the Huculs to supernatural causes and malignant spirits, against whom the most potent remedy is the word of incantation or conjuration. Even the educated Huculs have little faith in scientific modern methods of medical treatment. Poverty, though doubtless a factor, is far less important than the conviction that the native medicine men and their lengthily administered charms, incantations, and remedies, adjusted to suit each individual person and case, are far more reliable and successful than physicians, educated by "foreigners" in Vienna, Lwów, or Chernauti, and their prescribed and standard medicaments purchased in drugstores. Many families which visit doctors in order to meet the social demands, and to acquire prestige, consult at the same time, behind the doctor's back, a famous native-healer in the vicinity, and the counsel of the latter is preferred and adhered to. I myself used to know a rich Zhabie Hucul who possessed a collection of medicaments prescribed to him and to his family on various occasions by many doctors, some of them outstanding and well known in the region. —"They have never been opened" —he would boast, adding with a sly smile— "and this is why I myself and all my family are still alive and healthy."[4] It is easily understood that a doctor's brief examination and his prescribed medicines must have been looked upon with a great deal of suspicion, when compared with the long healing-ceremony and the old-fashioned personal remedies, sanctioned by the tradition of generations and in many cases by experience.[5]

Popular remedies fall roughly into two categories: charms— written formulas and texts, usually on tangible magic objects (amulets), whose purpose is mainly preventive; and incantations —oral formulas possessing magic significance and having a therapeutic purpose.[6]

The healer is not consulted with regard to every sickness. Usually each Hucul family, or at least one member of it, has a knowledge of quite an impressive number of standard remedies passed on from generation to generation and the treatment is often "domestic," i.e., undertaken without help from outside. Only in serious, persistent, or complicated cases, which are ascribed to the direct influence of spirits (nychista syla[7]—"an impure power"), is a professional healer called in or visited.

Generally, the native medicine man is called a znakhor (fem. znakhorka; from znaty—to know), a man with supernatural powers, often believed to have obtained his knowledge directly from God.[8] The Huculs however prefer the term likar—healer, when speaking

of medicine men in general; actually a specifying term is ordinarily used instead. The modern term "doctor" is reserved for the university-educated physician; as used by the shepherds and mountaineers it had until recently a derogatory, a ridiculing connotation.

The Huculs distinguish among several kinds of znakhor-likar; the most important among them is the prymiunyk—enchanter (verb: prymovyety—to enchant;[9] noun: prymiuka—incantation[10]). He is most widely sought after, for he deals with the most dangerous spirits. People often travel many miles to consult a master (holovnyi) prymiunyk of high repute, and they pay him high fees for his services.[11] Since his power is entirely beneficent and helpful, he is held not only in fearful respect but also in grateful affection. Although a ceremonial procedure which is sometimes very elaborate accompanies the incantation (and to an outsider the ceremonial may even seem to outshine the incantation itself), the power of the word is the enchanter's main tool; all the magic objects used during the procedure are of lesser importance. A beginning (apprentice) prymiunyk is called bambir, and his action—bambiryty. He knows only a little bid (shosh trokhe) of thesacred art, and his services are cheaper, but conscientious as he is, he will often refer the patient to a more highly qualified prymiunyk, and will not take the responsibility upon his own shoulders.[12]

Red-hot objects (coals) and water, used for extinguishing of the fire (vidhashuvanye vatry), are the most popular incantational materials used by the prymiunyk. As the enchanter's power extends over all living beings, he may perform also a veterinarian's function, healing livestock, returning to cows their "lost" milk, etc. "General" enchanters have become scarce during recent decades, a result of a strong trend toward specialization. Envying the doctors and adjusting themselves to the demands of the modern era of competition, the enchanters have limited their fields of action, and among the enchanters of the 1930's one could find specialists in children's diseases, high fever, mushroom-poisoning, swellings, paralysis, sheep and goat diseases, snake bites, etc.—all in the limited area of folk medicine, not counting enchanters in love-inducing, future-telling, etc.[13]

Unlike the harmless prymiunyk, whose functions are benevolent, the second class of znakhor-likar, the malfar, can cause also evil, harm, and even death to people and livestock by using the "impure power" which stands at his disposal and obeys him faithfully. Often, however, the malfar acts benevolently.

The third type of znakhor-likar, an enchanter who does evil exculsively and who uses his power to cast evil spells, to cause

illness, harm, and even death, is called pochinavnyk. Another type of enchanter whose main magic power is in compelling people to do his will, is called chinkar. These words, containing the root of the verb chinyty ("to do, make"), are probably replacing the taboo words magician, sorcerer, etc.[14]

Unlike the prymiunyky, all other enchanters are feared and hated by the Huculs. This explains why the Uniat clergy has found much assistance in its struggle against sorcery among the Hucul masses. Only in its fight against the prymiunyky, the helpful folk-healers, has the clergy struggled unsuccessfully, failing because of the lack of popular backing. The turning point in the struggle of the Church against Hucul popular belief in magic and sorcery (launched around the middle of the nineteenth century), was the 1899 tour of the Hucul mountain parishes (parafia) by Andreas Sheptycki,[15] then the thirty-four-year-old bishop of Stanisławów, nominated one year later (October 31, 1900) to the post of Metropolitan of Lwów. Thanks to his erudition, enthusiasm, and evident love for the people he addressed, he convinced many of them that faith in human power is foolish, and that the enchanters are impostors and cheats. The first instances of the Hucul masses attempting to consult doctors date back to that year. Folk-imagination ascribed the bishop's nomination to the highest Church post to the result of his victory over evil forces during the previous year, and before forty years had passed, aged eyewitnesses would tell tales of magic contests between the Holy Visitor (then His Excellency the Metropolitan) and the chief of the malfary in the Hucul-land, Prot' Daraduda from Douhopol (Bukovina). However, as previously mentioned, sorcery's decline (even though not a fall) has never applied to the prymiunyky.

Common to all kinds of enchanters is their "New Year" on the eve of the Uvyedenye Day (December 4). Then they are supposed to practice self-incantations to ensure their powers and personal security during the forthcoming year; on that most holy night no one dares to bring a case of illness to the enchanter for treatment, even though the patient's life itself may be involved.

The greatest dangers threatening the enchanter come from other enchanters. In addition to practical competitive factors, there is a continuous struggle which is being waged for a higher position in the enchanter hierarchy of the area, and any successes or failures are immediately noticed by and made known among the population. This results in professional malfar groupings, centered around leaders—outstanding malfary who are hostile toward each other.

The magic formulas or texts are regarded by the enchanter as top-secret material, a knowledge of which by unauthorized persons may impair or even invalidate its power and effect. But as they are repeated and usually pronounced quite clearly by the enchanter, they become in the course of time common knowledge. Certain incantations, however, even if commonly known, are effective only when performed or suggested by the enchanter.[16]

The usual explanation of an obvious failure is that the patient has not followed the enchanter's directions strictly.[17] The tasks assigned to the patient in the five incantations which I reproduce below are relatively moderate in comparison with those in other Hucul incantations.

Common to all the Hucul incantations[18] are: (1) the constant use of the magic number nine, (2) the merging of Christian and non- (pre- ?) Christian elements, and (3) the strong rythmic element.

(1) The use of nine. The use of mystical numbers in general and of nine in particular in healing charms and incantations (based on the nine months of the duration of pregnancy?) was known already in the second millenium B. C.[19] Though among the Huculs seven might have been expected to be the most frequently used number, because of the influence of the Scriptures and the Church, it is hardly to be found in Hucul incantations.[20] As in general folk-medicine, [21] nine or some multiple of it is the dominant power. There is no evidence that nine is used as a multiple of three; all data indicate that in itself it is a magic number going probably back to the remote past.[22] It is common in the ten Rumanian incantations against illness of animals published by M. Gaster,[23] where among others the following accumulated phrases occur: "She [the cow] was met by nine evil-eyed ones, nine witches, and nine takers-away of mana";[24] "I cut nine handfuls of flowers, I gathered love from nine jolly widows, from nine beautiful girls, from nine kings, and nine rulers." Another Rumanian incantation[25] contains ninety-nine spells, which of course is not accidental.

Besides the "nines" in each of the following incantations, "nines" occur very often in Hucul cures and healing-incantations: "drinking nine lice in a glass of brandy" in a fever cure,[26] "nine different grains" in a "cure-all,"[27] "dung inserted under a horse-shoe for nine days" in a tuberculosis-cure,[28] "water from nine wells, drawn nine times from each" for the "extinguishing of fire,"[29] "the nine-bottomed sea" in an incantation against an evil spell,[30] a substance composed of "lime from nine churchyard tombs, nine

grains of pepper stolen from nine stores, nine needles bought without bargaining from nine stores, excrements from nine cats,"[31] etc.

In the manuscript incantations multiples of nine (18, 27, 900) are also common.[32]

(2) The merging of Christian and pagan elements is evident (cf. especially Incantation IV below) in the influence of the ecclesiastical-literary language, which played in general a significant role in the formulation of many incantations. Sokolov[33] suggests that the Russian clergy, which performed in the course of their activities prayers and complicated ceremonies not limited to the church building alone (e.g., baptisms, weddings, etc.), may have composed, or at least in a definite manner stylized the incantations, too. This statement can be expanded to the entire body of the Greek Orthodox Church and its extremely rich ritual.[34]

Most of the manuscript Hucul incantations, like those of other Slavic peoples,[35] begin and end with the ecclesiastical formulas: "In the name of the Father and the Son" (von n'Otsa i Syna) and "Amen," respectively.

(3) The rhythm shows traits generally found in Slavic incantations.[36]

I. Incantation Against Snake-Bite

The patient, who is supposed to bring with him a needle and some garlic, must not move during the entire procedure. After the limb which has been bitten is bound above the bitten place (a woman patient must not be bound!), the incantation is repeated nine times. While repeating it, the prymiunyk scrapes bagy (dottle) from his l'ul'ka (pipe), smears it on the garlic, powders them together, urinates on it, and then rubs the bitten place with this compound. The incantation text is as follows:[37]

Tsy lojka tsy loia,	Whether a little snake or a [big] snake,
Tsy vylizla yz korinia tsy z kaminia	Whether it crept from a root or from a stone,
Pustyla volodu u sherst',	Injected the poison into the body-hair,
A z sherst'y u shkiru,	And from the hair into the skin,
A z shkiry u plinu,	And from the skin into its lining,
A z pliny u mnieso,	And from the lining into the flesh,

A z mniesa u zhyly,	And from the flesh into the veins,
A z zhyly u krou,	And from the veins into the blood,
A z kryvy u sertse.	And from the blood into the heart.
Yz sertsia viklykayetsy u krou,	From the heart you are called out into the blood,
Yz kryvy u zhyly,	From the blood into the veins,
Yz zhylyj u mnieso,	From the veins into the flesh,
Yz mniesa u plinu,	From the flesh into the lining (of the skin),
Yz pliny u shkiru,	From the lining into the skin,
Yz shkiry u sherst'.	From the skin into the hair.

This prymiuka was recorded in Zhabie-Krasnik (1934) from the prymiunyk Ivan Bojchuk, an illiterate Hucul then sixty-seven years old.

Snake-bite incantations have been among the most popular in Europe.[38] The formula of expulsion (occuring also in the second half of Incantation IV below), accompanied by a detailed list of the body-parts from which the sickness is being expelled, is frequent in all these incantations against snake-bite. The formula is based on the magic power of the word and in the belief that a body-part not mentioned specifically by name may escape the magical influence.[39]

The use of urine is based on the widespread belief, very common among the Huculs, in valuable qualities of human exrements.[40] The same may be said about garlic,[41] whose curative and magic qualities can be traced back to ancient times.[42] The purpose of the needle brought by the patient is not clear.

II. Incantation Against Strong Headache and the Evil Eye

A bucket of water is drawn from a well. Then a fire is made in a stove and the following are placed on top of it (prypichok) in the following order: two spoons, one birch twig, two spoons, one spindle, two spoons, one fork.

After the fire burns out, one piece of charcoal is thrown from the cinders into the bucket of water, and then a heated spoon is laid aside. The prymiunyk says: "Not nine." Then another piece of charcoal is thrown into the water, and the second spoon put aside. The prymiunyk says: "Not eight." This is repeated with diminishing numbers until the ninth piece of charcoal is thrown

into the water, the last (ninth) item, the fork, is laid aside and the phrase "Not one" is uttered.

Finally the water from the bucket is poured upon the patient and the following incantation is pronounced:

Khto uziu,	Who (ever) took (it?),
Abykh sy rozsiu.	Let him burst.

The informant was Maria Segedyniuk, an illiterate Hucul woman, fifty-five years old, from Zhabie.

The above-quoted short incantation is not clear. It may be a variant of another incantation against the evil eye, recorded in Pokucie:[43] Khto ti vrik, naj ti vozme!" (Whoever enchanted you, let him take you!)

Severe headache is generally regarded as a serious disease, and suitable therefore for incantation.[44] The same is true of the "evil eye"; it is regarded as the result of bewitching, and it is treated with a multitude of elaborate incantations, and accompanied usually by the ceremony of "extinguishing fire (coals)."[45]

The use of numbers, based probably on subtractive magic in accordance with the popular Pythagorean principle of the virtues of numbers, is supposed to reduce a disease by counting it off. One of the incantations given by Marcellus Burdigalensis, a Gallo-Roman of the fifth century, and used for curing pains or disorders in the throat or jaws with evident reference to tonsils (glandulae), starts with nine, then eight, etc., girls, until they are reduced to one and nothing.[46]

The pouring of cold water over the patient's head is very common as a cure for fever and headache. Sometimes even while the patient is asleep, the water may be poured to frighten the fever-demons, who "run away never to return again."[47]

III. Incantation Against Erysipelas Wound-Scab, Eye Disease, Swelling

Yarn is made into nine balls (galky), the aching place is covered with homemade (unbought!) cloth, then the yarn balls are burnt over the aching place while the prymiunyk utters:

Khrestytsy porozhenyj imnye. . . .[48]	A person born [and] christened with the name. . . .[48]
Khochiu ruzhu palyty:	I want to burn the rose:
Bila, chiervonna, chiorna.	White, red, black.
Uzielasy tsy yz spania,	Whether it originated from sleeping,

Tsy z yidy, tsy z pynnoho khodu,	Whether from eating, or from fast walking,
Tsy z velykykh kharchiu,	Whether from much food,
Tsy z pohanykh ochij.	Or from evil eyes.
Kostovu, zhylovu, pidshkirnu,	[Whether] bony, venous, subcutaneous,
Paliuchu, lupuchu.	Burning, [or] peeling.
Tsy zhinochi ochi, tsy parubochi,	Whether the eyes of women or youths,
Diuchinyechi, khlopyechi, mushinksi,	Of girls, boys, [or] men,
Tsy strila, tsy ruzia, zeliznytsia,	Whether an arrow [lumbago], a weapon [rose?] or a disease,
Ny maye strilyety, koloty, lupaty,	It can neither hit, nor prick, nor peel,
Ny maye motsy smert' zaudavaty.	It has no power to cause death.

The incantation and course of procedure like Incantation II above were recorded from Maria Segedyniuk.

Incantations against erysipelas and especially against erysipelas of the face are among the most popular in general folk-medicine.[49] K. K. Haase published[50] as many as thirty-six different incantations against erysipelas recorded in a single German Grafschaft. Incantations against eye diseases,[51] wounds, [52] and swellings[53] are also popular in folk-medicine.

The healing ceremony is based probably on fumigation, called "smoking under" (pidkurity). Instead of the unspectacular yarn balls, in this case other, more unusual objects are in demand for purposes of fumigation: the Ten Commandments in Hebrew, a shirt in which someone has died, the dried testicles of a horse, matsa (Jewish Passover bread), sticks from a willow broom used for sweeping the church, etc.[54]

IV. Incantation Against Boils (Carbuncles)

Water is drawn from a well into a bucket, and then poured from it with a little spoon "nine-times-nine" times into the bowl of the prymiunyk. While the water is being poured, the following incantation is uttered:

Voda yes, sveta yes.	Thou art water, thou art holy.
Voda yes, zhiva yes.	Thou art water, thou art living.

Voda yes, tsila yes.	Thou art water, thou art whole (untouched).
Vodichka osyeshenna,	Dear sanctified (made holy) water,
Okriplenna kilom Khrystovym na Ordani,[55]	Strengthened by Christ's body on Jordan (Day),[55]
Koly tebe Khrystos osyetyu na Ordani kilom svoyim,	Since Christ has sanctified you on Jordan (Day) by his body,
Okripliuyes, osyetiuyes kilom svoyim.	You will strengthen, sanctify by your body.
Kripistou vodu syeiu,	I sprinkle with strengthening water,
Na kripist' vid tebe, Hospoda,	For strengthening from You, Lord,
Dushu y kilo. . . .[56]	The spirit and the body of. . . .[56]
Vodichko syeta vid Khrysta okriplenna,	Dear holy water, strengthened by Christ,
Osyeshenna kilom Khrystovym	Blessed by Christ's body
Na pomich liudem y khudobi,	For assistance to people and livestock,
Vodichko syeta, iak myyesh luhy y berehy,	Dear holy water, as you wash meadows and shores,
Obmyj shestoho khoroho,	Wash also this sick (man),
Kotryj zhyedaye z Bozheyi voly.	Who is longing by God's will.
Dushu y kilo khoroho	The spirit and the body of the sick (man)
Poblahoslavy, Hospodi, yrtamy svoyemy,	Bless, Lord, with Your lips,
Y svoyim dukhom okripy	And strengthen with Your spirit
Vid lykhoho chyesu,	Against evil time,
Vid tyeshkoyi bolizny.	Against heavy pain [illness].
Vizyvayemo tebe, Hospody,	We call You, Lord,
Y prosymo do pomochi Prechistu Divu,	And we beg the Purest Virgin for help,
Y Nykolaia Bozhoho:	And Saint Nykolay:
Stan'te oboronyty vid lykhoho chyesu,	Arise to defend against evil time,
Vid tyeshkoyi bolizny khoroho.	Against heavy illness, the sick (man).
Prosymo tebe, Hospoda,	We beg You, Lord,

Anheli khranyteli, dukhy bozhi,	Guardian angels, holy spirits,
Y prosymo syetochky bozhi,	And we beg the dear holy Saints,
Usi rokovi, starshi y menshi,	Of the entire year, the elder and the younger (ones),
Abyste prostyly	That you may forgive
Sho u syeta robymo.	What we are doing (sinning) on the (your) holy days.
Prostite i pokripite tseho khoroho.	Forgive and strengthen this sick (man).
Vasha ulasnist', vasha volia, vasha ye slava	Your attribute, your will, your your fame is
Okripyty y uveselyty dushu y kilo,	To strengthen and to cheer the spirit and the body,
Tsu dushku khoru. . . .[57]	This sick dear soul [of]. . . .[57]
Vybyrayemo, vyzyvayemo tyeshku boliznu	We take out, we call out the grave sickness
Vid sertsa do pochiok,	From the heart to the kidneys,
Vid pochiok do potrushkiu,	From the kidneys to the liver,
Vid potrushkiu do zholudka,	From the liver to the stomach
Vid zholudka do kishechiok,	From the stomach to the bowels,
Vid kishechiok do sustavochiok,	From the bowels to the joints,
Vid sustavochiok do zhylochiok,	From the joints to the veins,
Vid zhylochiok do kistochiok,	From the veins to the bones,
Vid kistochiok do holosnychiok,	From the bones to the sinews,
Vid holosnychiok do mniesa,	From the sinews to the flesh,
Vid mniesa do skiry,	From the flesh to the skin,
Vid skiry—von! von! von![58]	From the skin—hence! hence! hence![58]
Lykhyj chyes, pohanyj zhyes,	Bad time, evil monster,
Ydy sobi ny povoly, bo ty pidesh po nyvoly.	Unless you be gone of your own will, you will go against your will.
Zaberysy, lykhyj chyese, pohanyj zhyese!	Take yourself away, bad time, evil monster!
Ny sushy, ny vyely, ny paly,	Do not dry, do not shrink, do not burn,
Ale zaberysy!	But take yourself away!
Shyesbys, propadaubys, motsy ny maubys!	Vanish, disappear, and have no power!

The incantation and the course of procedure were recorded in 1934 from Andzhej Zuziak, an eighty-eight-year-old Hucul from Zhabie.

The text can easily be broken down into eighty-one phrases corresponding to the "nine-times-nine" water-pourings. The members of the body are referred to in the diminutive, endearing form (translated above as "dear") probably to secure their close cooperation.

Invocation of Saints, often endowed in folk-narratives and legends with great powers of miraculous healing,[59] are common in healing incantations.[60]

V. Incantation Against Children's Disease

The sick child is carried to a double-trunked willow or pear tree. Nine holes are drilled in the tree. Then the child is carried over the tree trunk nine times, while nine paternosters (otchenashiu) are uttered. The following incantation is chanted:

Vid dytyny try dushi beru,	I take from the child three souls,
Y tut zabyvaiu.	And here I drive [them].

Then plugs are driven into the nine drilled holes, and the prymiunyk or the parent runs away with the child.

The informant was Warwara Geleta, a Hucul woman from Kzhyvorovna-Berezhnica, who in 1934 was seventy years old.

The disease was called by the informant "having three souls" (iak dytyna maye try dushi), but I have not been able to identify it. It is probably connected with continuous weeping and capriciousness of the child.

Notes

1. The Polish spelling has become fixed in European usage. Bolshaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 2nd ed., XIII (1952), 241, estimates the number of Huculs in 1948 as 250,000 to 300,000, all of them in what is now the western Ukraine. For basic ethnographical data the works of Kolberg, Szuchiewicz, and Kaindl, though written half a century ago, are still indispensable: O. Kolberg, Pokucie, obraz etnograficzny, 4 vols. (Kraków, 1882-89); W. Szuchiewicz, Huculszczyzna, 4 vols. (Lwów, 1902-08); R. F. Kaindl, Die Huzulen, ihr Leben, ihre Sitten und ihre Volksüberlieferung (Vienna, 1894). Kaindl, a professor at the Chernovits (Bukovina) University, supplemented his book by later articles, published mainly in Globus and Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde (referred to below as ZfVk), as well as by data in his general Die Volkskunde, ihre Bedeutung, ihre Ziele und ihre Methode (Leipzig, Vienna, 1903).

Cf. also L. A. Boyd, Polish Countrysides (New York, 1937), pp. 39, 99.

2. R. F. Kaindl, "Zauberglaube bei den Huzulen," Globus, LXXVI (1899); "Wetterzauberei bei den Rutenen und Huzulen," Mitteilungen der geogr. Gesellschaft in Wien, XXXVII (1894); A. Onyshchuk, "Materialy do huculskoyi demonologyi," Materialy ukrainskoyi etnologyi, XL (Lwów, 1909); S. Koenig, "Magical Beliefs and Practices among the Galician Ukrainians," Folklore, XLVIII (1937), 59-91; S. Vincenz, Na wysokiej Połoninie, 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1936), I, 115-137. See also the references in the preceding note.

3. This hypothesis is strongly advocated by M. Gaster in his History of the Rumanian Popular Literature (Bucarest, 1883), pp. 406 ff., and Rumanian Bird and Beast Stories (Publications of the Folklore Society, No. 75, London, 1915), pp. 22 ff., 348; cf. also M. Beza, Paganism in Roumanian Folklore (London, 1928), containing many Slavic-Rumanian parallels. F. H. Groome's theory of the diffusion of folktales over Europe by the Gipsies, advanced in In Gipsy Tents (London, 1880), and held since then in high esteem by leading Balkan folklorists with regard to folklore transmission in general, is still to be considered, in spite of Gaster's (p. 24) criticism. Cf. R. D. Jameson, "Romany Folklore," in Funk and Wagnalls, Standard Dictionary of Folklore, 2 vols. (New York, 1949-1950).

4. He was not the first Hucul boaster of this kind; cf. Kaindl, Die Huzulen, p. 93.

5. Historians of medicine tend more and more to esteem not only the psychological-suggestive but also the scientific elements of folk-healing. See W. C. Alvarez, "The Emergence of Modern Medicine from Ancient Folkways," Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute for 1937, pp. 409-430.

6. Unfortunately, an adequate theoretical treatment of the various terms connected with popular beliefs and their definitions is still lacking in English; the Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore is very disappointing in this respect; cf. also the incorrect translattion of zagovor — "charm" (instead of "incantation") in Y. M. Sokolov, Russian Folklore, tr. by C. R. Smith (New York, 1950), pp. 241 ff. — The basic material on the subject of charms and incantations, as well as rich bibliographic references are found in the Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, 10 vols. (1927-1941), referred to below as HdA, s.v. "Beschwörung," "besprechen," etc. Literature on healing incantations recorded before 1895 is listed in M. Bartels, "Über Krankheits-Beschwörungen," ZfVk, V (1895), 1-40. An outstanding, though old, English treatment of the subject is W. G. Black's Folk-Medicine (Publications of the Folklore Society, No. 12; London, 1883).

7. The same transliteration for Ukrainian as for Russian is used in this paper with the following exceptions:

в—v (u when final, and then pronounced as consonantal w)
и—y
й—j
ї—yi
є—ye

8. Cf. Kolberg, III, 161; Szuchiewicz, IV, 297, 312; Koenig, pp. 79 f.

9. The English usage of enchant refers not only to the uttering of an incantation, but also to the casting of any spell.

10. Cf. Polish przymówka or zamawianie, Russian zagovor, German Besprechung, all of which emphasize the talking, or oral characteristics of the incantation. The Hucul incantation is neither chanted nor sung, as the Latin in-cantare, on which English and French incantation is based, may indicate. On carmen—incantamentum, see X. F. M. G. Wolters, Notes on Antique Folklore (Amsterdam, 1935), pp. 135 ff.

11. See Kaindl, in Globus, LXXVI, 277; Kolberg, III, 161.

12. In the Nadvirna district (povit) the prymiunyk is called bayiunyk and his action bayity; cf. Slovak bajnik—"poet."

13. Cf. Koenig, p. 80.

14. Cf. the English usage of "to say words," "to try for it," etc., in L. H. Wrenshall, "Incantations and Popular Healing in Maryland and Pennsylvania," Journal of American Folklore (called below JAF), XV (1902), 268-274.

15. Born in 1865, from his years of study and ordination (1892) until his death (1940), he was, as head of the Uniat, the spiritual and religious leader of the western Ukrainians. Cf. (Munich) Ukraine in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, III (1954), 64-71.

16. Cf. Koenig, p. 80.

17. Cf. Szuchiewicz, IV, 313.

18. This generalization is based, in addition to the materials already published, on manuscripts of incantations containing altogether more than 600 lines, and put generously at my disposal by Dr. Stanisław De Vincenz, Grenoble, France. I hope to publish them on some other occasion.

19. Cf. the references under D 1273.1 in Stith Thompson's Motif-Index to Folk-Literature, 6 vols. (Helsinki, 1932-1936). A Babylonian charm speaks of "enslaving by means of the number"; cf. Black, p. 121.

20. Two manuscript incantations, one against erysipelas, and the other against paralysis mention seventy-seven kinds of diseases. The latter one refers also to seventy veins and to seventy bones.

21. Cf. Black, pp. 118 ff.

22. Cf. the nine heads of the hydra, the virtues of nine knots

known, according to Pliny, Hist. Nat. XXVIII.12, to the magi, the nine-times repeated processions around the town to treat, according to Pontanus, the bite of a mad dog; and the incantation from Marcellus, under Incantation II in this paper. Cf. also Black, p. 121, and the references under D 1273.1.3.1 in T. P. Cross, Motif-Index to Early Irish Literature (Bloomington, Ind.; Indiana University Publications, Folklore Series No. 7, 1952).

23. Rumanian Bird and Beast Stories, pp. 348-354.

24. Mana, which in Rumanian means virtue, abundance, blessing, stands several times in the Hucul manuscript incantations for "milk."

25. Published by T. Papahagi in Din Folklorul Romania (Bucarest, 1923), pp. 166-168; cf. Beza, p. 25.

26. Koenig, p. 87.

27. Kolberg, III, 162.

28. Koenig, p. 90.

29. MS. (see note 18), before several incantations.

30. MS. (see note 18): Yz omrazystoho devyeto-dennoho morskoho dna spoda.

31. MS. (see note 18), before casting a spell (roblenye omrazy).

32. "Burning" erysipelas with 27 knots, expelling paralysis to beyond 27 (trydevyeti) mountains, 27 gates, 27 locks, etc.

33. Page 253.

34. Blending and interinfluence of Christian and pagal elements in healing incantations is emphasized in O. Eberman, Blut und Wundesegen im ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt (Berlin, 1903); G. Lammert, Volksmedizin und medizinischer Aberglaube (Würzburg, 1869); Sokolov, pp. 242 f. Cf. also the bibliographical references in HdA, I, 1167, n. 116, and in Sokolov, pp. 245 f., 256 f. On invocation of saints in incantations, see Incantation IV in this paper.

35. Cf. V. Mansikka, Über russische Zauberformeln (Helsinki, 1909); Sokolov, pp. 249, 251.

36. Cf. Sokolov, p. 248.

37. I have left the texts as originally (phonetically) recorded, without attempting to correct the numerous inconsistencies and grammatical errors. I have in mind the prospective student of the Hucul language, a Ukrainian dialect with evident Polish, Rumanian, and Magyar influences. Cf. marzhyna (cattle), loia, malfar, khory, etc.; on the form abych in Incantation II, see E. Decaux, "Altpoln. abych byli, iżbych uzdrowili," Zeitschrift f. slav. Philologie, XXII (1954), 379-383. I wish to thank Miss Tatiana Sklanczenko, Lecturer in Slavic Studies at Indiana University, for her help in the interpretation of obscure passages in the texts.

38. Cf. A. Wuttke, Der deutsche Volksaberglaube der Gegenwart, rev. ed. by E. Meyer (Berlin, 1900), p. 346. (First edition, Berlin, 1869.)

39. Cf. the Byelorussian incantation in Sokolov, p. 251.

40. Kolberg, III, 164; Koenig, p. 86; Kaindl, Die Huzulen, p. 95.

41. Cf. Koenig, p. 87, on fever and toothache cure.

42. Cf. D. Neuman (Noy), "Motif-Index to Talmudic-Midrashic Literature" (diss., Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1954), under D 1385 and D 2071.1.—Eating garlic against snake-bites is known in Tirol; see I. Zingerle, Sitten, Bräuche und Meinungen des Tiroler Volkes, 2nd ed. (Innsbruck, 1891), p. 111.

43. Kolberg, III, 132.

44. Cf. O. Hovorka and A. Kronfeld, Vergleichende Volksmedizin, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1908-09), I, 144.

45. Cf. Koenig, pp. 83 f.

46. Cf. J. Grimm, Über Marcellus Burdigalensis (Berlin, 1849); G. Leland in JAF, II (1889), 113 f., connects Marcellus' subtractive incantation with the American children's song "Ten Little Indians." For other subtractive incantations from nine downwards, see Black, pp. 122 f.

47. Kolberg, III, 173; Koenig, pp. 87, 90.

48. The patient's Christian name must be loudly uttered.

49. Cf. the references in HdA, I, 1170, notes 147 f., and Wrenshall, pp. 268-274.

50. ZfVk, VII (1897), 405-36.

51. Cf. HdA, I, 1168, n. 143.

52. Hovorka-Kronfeld, I, 144; Zeitschrift f. österreichische Volkskunde, VI (1900), 115; H. Zahler, Die Krankheit im Volksglauben (Bern, 1898), p. 85; Urquell, I (1890), 204; E. Stemplinger, Antike und moderne Volksmedizin (Leipzig, 1925), p. 82; HdA, I, 1170, n. 162.

53. Hovorka-Kronfeld, I, 63; Urquell, loc. cit.; L. Strackerjan, Aberglaube und Sagen, 2 vols. (Oldenburg, 1909), I, 73; ZfVk, IX (1899), 209; HdA, I, 1170, n. 151.

54. Kolberg, III, 162; Koenig, p. 88.

55. The name of the Holy Water festival and ceremony (on January 6), when water is drawn from the frozen village river through a cross-shaped form cut in the ice; see V. Scherbakivskyi, "Ukrainisches Brauchtum," ZfVk, XLVIII (1939), 302.

56. The patient's Christian name must be loudly uttered.

57. Idem.

58. Spitting accompanies each of the three exclamations von ("hence"). On the healing role of spitting (known already in antiquity) and its use in incantations, cf. Black, pp. 184 f., Motif-Indices under D 1001 and D 1500.1.9, and Wolters, pp. 68 f.

59. Cf. the references under V 221 in the Motif-Indices.

60. Cf. Bartels, p. 34; H. Hoehn, Volksheilkunde (Stuttgart, 1920), p. 74; Black, Ch. V: "Our Lord and the Saints in Folk-Medicine," pp. 75 ff.

THE ORIGINS OF SLAVIC sǫbota

By Bernard S. Mikofsky
Visiting Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies
at Indiana University

Though the origins of the various Slavic names for the days of the week have been the object of considerable study for more than a century, the problem has not yet received a satisfactory solution. Nor has it been clearly determined what cultural influences were operative in the appearance of these borrowings in the Slavic lexicon at the time when the Slavs were first becoming part of the medieval European civilization from the fourth through the ninth centuries; that is, from the time when the Slavs were part of the Gothic Black Sea Empire to the Christianization of the Slavs by Cyril and Methodius. The solution of this entire problem is of considerable importance for the larger, over-all picture not only of the Christian terminology but also of the culture of the early Slavs.

If Christian terminology is thought of as an architectonic whole, then one of the important arches in the edifice would be the names of the days of the week. In turn, the very keystone of that arch for the Slavs is the Slavic form of the ancient word Sabbath.

Unfortunately, there is difficulty with regard to this keystone, for the Slavs have not one, but two forms for the Sabbath word: one, an Eastern form, sǫbota, presupposing a source form *sambat(a), the other, a largely Western form, sobota, presupposing *sabbat(a). This problem of an East-West split in the keystone day has occupied the interest of scholars, such as Friedrich Kluge, Wilhelm Schulze, Gustav Meyer, Petar Skok, and Stender-Petersen.

It is quite clear that the Slavic forms with a formerly nasalized vowel in the first syllable—these include Russian subbota< sǫbota and the Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Serbian and even Croatian[1] forms—cannot be derived directly from the classical (literary or Church) form in Greek or even Latin. Thus, the situation may be represented by:

Hebr. šabbāth > Gr. σάββατον > ...? ...> Slav. sǫbota (the question mark represents the missing transitional forms).

The theories which have been advanced to account for the existence of these two forms of the Sabbath word in Slavic languages fall into three main[2] categories: (1) an older theory, held

by Miklosich, to the effect that Slavic sǫbota derives from OHG. sambaz;[3] (2) a later theory—developed by Kluge, Meyer, Schulze, and Stender-Petersen, though with various individual differences—to the effect that sǫbota derives, through the intermediary of a popular Gothic *sambotô, from a popular Greek *σάμβατον (developed possibly under Asia Minor Greek and Semitic influence); (3) a theory more recently advanced by Skok that "sǫbota corresponds to Balkan Latin and sabbata to the territory of the Latin of the Patriarchate of Aquileia."[4] Still more condensed, these three points of view might be termed the hypotheses of: (1) the Germanic milieu, (2) the Greco-Arian-Gothic milieu, and (3) the Latinic (i.e., Latin and Romance) milieu.

As to the facts and findings represented in the above points of view, it will be convenient to take up theories (1) and (3) first. Though appearing later than most of the studies presenting the second point of view, the third point of view acts largely as a critique of the first, and almost completely ignores the materials and ideas of the second.

Miklosich, the proponent of theory (1), of the Germanic milieu, tends to scant the explanations in his classic study of the Christian terminology of the Slavs. Thus, as he associates Slavic sǫbota with OHG. sambaz[-tag] and quite correctly does not derive it directly from Gr. σάββατον, he makes however no attempt to explain the appearance of an intrusive nasal consonant m in the German form itself. Furthermore, in a rather enigmatic explanation he says that the Slavic "t for [OHG.] z is based on an OHG. sambat, or, and this is more probable, is influenced by the Latin form."[5] (In his Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen [Vienna, 1886] he says, under sombota "OS. Sǫbota corresponds to a G[erman] sambat, whence OHG. sambaztac [sic]. . . . The nasalization is unexplained.") Miklosich should have starred the *sambat, since no such form is documented. Furthermore, as will be noted later, in discussing F. Kluge's contribution to the problem, the assumption of an OHG. sambat with t instead of z is not warranted by the facts.

Miklosich derives Rum. sâmbătă and Magyar szombat from the Slavic, a secondary conclusion generally agreed to, though Skok objects to Miklosich's referring of Rum. sâmbătă back to a Slavic form, on the grounds, among others, that the other Rumanian names of the days of the week [Dumíneca, Luni, Marţi, Miércuri, Joi, Víneri] are of Latin origin. Skok quite properly objects that Miklosich ignores the existence of the sobota forms side by side with the sǫbota ones, and points out that if as Miklosich believed the Slavic name for Saturday derived from the German, then we might quite

reasonably expect that the nasal would make its appearance in precisely those Slavic languages which are neighbors of the German.[6] But the contrary is actually the case, with those Slavic languages farthest from the German—Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, and Russian —showing the ǫ< am, while those close to the Germans have only the o<a. Finally, Skok notes that Miklosich ignores the feminine -a ending,[7] and Skok, as we shall point out later, uses the -a ending[8] to bolster his hypothesis of Romance influences on the Slavic sǫbota, sobota.

In general, Skok criticizes Miklosich for being too much the Germanist: "The great savant in this [article 'Die christliche Terminologie der Slaven'] shows that he is sometimes too prone to acknowledge German influence where the latter has not figured," and specifically, of course, in the case of Slavic sǫbota which Miklosich "explained by OHG. sambaz. . . ."[9] But, as we shall soon see, Skok, in his turn, tends to lean too heavily in the direction of Latin-Romance influences in cases where they have probably not figured. Moreover, in heavily criticizing Miklosich's attribution of Slavic sǫbota to the OHG. sambaz, Skok turns out to be guilty of flogging dead horses, for in the wealth of material written in the fifty years between Miklosich's articles and those of Skok, the German scholars definitely do not maintain Miklosich's position, as we shall see later.

In analyzing Skok's views on this question, one is struck by the fact that he ignores the work of Friedrich Kluge, Gustav Meyer, and Wilhelm Schulze. Much of Skok's criticism of Miklosich was certainly valid, since Miklosich's thinking had been heavily slanted by the Pannonian[10] theory he favored, a theory long since rejected by Slavic scholars: As a patriotic Slovene, Miklosich was unable to resist the notion that Old (Church) Slavic was the Old Slovenian of the Slovenes of Pannonia. What we term Old (Church) Slavic or Old Bulgarian he called "altslovenisch." Miklosich, believing, as he did, that the Slavs owed their first knowledge of Christianity to the contacts of the Slovenes in Pannonia with the Germans, naturally tended to favor a German origin in many cases where the evidence was not sufficient.[11]

One must then ask what Skok's positive contribution is, aside from the purely critical elements discussed in connection with Miklosich's views. For one, Skok finds that the final -a of the sambata type seems to reflect Romance influence, and he cites Rumanian sâmbătă, Vegliote [Veglia = Krk] sabata, Frioulan sabide, Tyrolian sabeda, Engadine samda as examples of the form in final -a in Romance languages bordering on Slavic languages.

Skok also points to the Albanian *šëtúnë*.[12] One might object to Skok's inclusion of the Rumanian, where the situation is not too certain, for Slavic influenced the Rumanian language at least as much as the other way around. As for the Albanian form, it is so uncertain in itself that it can hardly be used as a proof for anything else. Albert Thumb gives *šëtúnë*, *štúnë*, also *štundë* and *štunne*, even *štunnia* as well as a *šetund* form; he concludes that one may refer the Albanian forms back to a **satunn-(ā)*, or also **sabatunn-(ā)*, but that the whole problem is quite obscure. Thus, (*Dies*) *Saturni* and *sabbatum* may have crossed and blended to produce the Albanian forms![13]

In Skok's statement following the above-mentioned Romance examples, one finds the essence of his theory and his positive contribution, whatever the weaknesses of this contribution may be:

> As for the final *-a*, one may hesitate; it may derive from a Slavic analogy as well as go back to the Latin; for the Rumanian and Albanian [examples] cause us to suppose already in the Balkan Latin a *sambata* with this final *-a*. It is unnecessary to maintain that the *m* interpolated here before the labial is of Oriental origin, as Meyer-Lübke would have it.[14] One finds the same sort of *m* before *b* in many an example in Vulgar Latin; I need only refer to *sabucus* alongside of *sambucus* and to *strambus* alongside of *strabus*, etc. The form *sambata* from Vulgar Latin seems to me to explain exactly the origin of Slavic *sǫbota*. The form of Vegliote *sabata*, etc., clarifies for us the *sobota* of the western Slavs. From the geographic point of view, *sambata* and *sabbata* from the Vulgar Latin agree exactly with the area of *sǫbota* and *sobota* in Slavic: *sǫbota* corresponds to Balkan Latin and *sabbata* to the territory of the [Low] Latin of the Patriarchate of Aquileia.[15]

Here we have a flat advocacy of a point of view I have called theory (3), that of the Latinic (Latin-Romance) milieu.

Issue should be taken with the ease with which Skok dismisses Meyer-Lübke's attribution of the epenthetic *m* here to Eastern influence. Moreover, the generalizing of this intercalated *m* on the basis of only two such isolated examples as *strambus* and *sambucus* from Vulgar Latin to cover the explanation of the *m* in a supposed Vulgar Latin **sambatum* is a dubious procedure. One is really hard put to it to discover "*many* an example" or the other cases implied by the "etc." Finally, Skok has assumed much about the historico-cultural state of affairs[16] which is really not at all certain. First of all, concerning Meyer-Lübke's statement, it is to be noted that Skok makes no attempt to refute the sources of this statement, sources which we shall refer to in

detail below. Meyer-Lübke says: "The -m- form [for the assumed *sambatum, from which certain Romance forms might then be derived] is Oriental . . . ; the Rumanian form is to be linked with the Greek-Slavic form; the North French, Southeast French, Graubünden [= Grisons, Switzerland] forms [are to be linked] with the German form."[17] Moreover, as to examples such as strambus and sambucus, Ernout and Meillet give no etymology for the sambūcus-sabūcus word,[18] thus lessening considerably its value as an evidence of a Latin tendency to intercalate m before b occasionally. Furthermore, Ernout and Meillet point out that the sabūcus has greater extension than the sambucus form, both of which are represented in the Romance languages.[19] As for strambus, this form is listed under strabus, which is considered a borrowing from στραβός στράβων, thus bringing the matter back to the Greek sphere! The word is also given as old and rare. Under sabbatum, Ernout and Meillet have the following: "Sabbatum (surtout au pl. sabbata; les l. romanes attestent un doublet sambatum, cf. M. L. [Meyer-Lübke] 7479, et v. sa(m)bucus, stra(m)bus: Emprunté à l'hébreu par l'intermédiaire du gr. σάββατα; apparaît dès l'époque impériale (Ov., Hor., etc.); panroman."[20] Ernout and Meillet interrelate the three cases but mention no other cases of -b-/-mb- in connection with this problem, where one would logically expect them to list all other significant parallels. They simply repeat the same questionable two cases that had previously appeared in the articles of others. Finally, as regards Skok's confident assumption of the historico-cultural formula as expressed in the relationship to Slavdom of Balkan Latinity and the Aquileian Patriarchate, he gives almost no supporting evidence. The main collateral element which Skok gives to support his view is represented by kryž' ("cross") from a Romance *croǧe[21] "qui a dû exister dans le parler d'Aquilée ou vénitien."[22] Kryž' is a problem in itself,[23] which I hope to discuss in a separate study. True enough, kryž' is of Romance origin, but how can this be applied to build up a picture of the total historico-cultural debt of Slavdom to the Patriarchate of Aquileia? Kryž' can point to Latin-Romance origins, in general, for some of the early Christian concepts used by Western Slavdom; but it certainly cannot be adduced for a specifically Aquileian origin, especially when not conjoined with historical or other evidence. Another of these collateral elements is, briefly, the prindi (=Monday)< Lat. primus dies of Frioulan, which is adjacent to a Slavic-speaking area. This Skok considers a conclusive proof of his formula.[24] It would seem that it could just as easily prove the opposite, since the nonplanetary system of Latin

called Monday not the first, but the second day; feria secunda, which form is reflected in Portuguese segunda-feira! As a matter of fact, these collateral elements, which are deserving of a special, detailed treatment not within the scope of the present study, are not consistently maintained by Skok himself. Witness, for example, Skok's statement: "The term for Wednesday in Vegliote, misedma = media hebdomas, attests to Wednesday as the middle of the week in the Romance speech in closest proximity to Slavic; but we know nothing about the geographic dispersion of this term at the time of the arrival of the Slavs in the [Balkan] Peninsula, and, because of this fact, it is difficult for us to reject the loan-translation sr̆ěda = Mittwoch in order to replace it by this other loan-translation sr̆ěda = media hebdomas."[25]

At this point, we naturally come to a consideration of just those materials which are conspicuous by their absence in Skok's treatment of the subject. These materials may be fruitfully dealt with in terms of their historical development in the hands, first of all, of Friedrich Kluge, then of Gustav Meyer and Wilhelm Schulze, and finally, quite recently, of Stender-Petersen. These scholars have, as we have already noted, developed the theory of a non-literary, non-Church *σάμβατον, passing through the agency of Gothic Arianism to the Slavs. These views I have called theory (3), that of the Greco-Arian-Gothic milieu.

An account of this development (not including, of course, Stender-Petersen's discussion, which comes in 1926) is given, with perhaps a minor inconsistency or two, by Friedrich Kluge himself in the closing number of a 1912 collection of some of his essays.[26] Kluge emphasized the significance of the sound shift in understanding the origin of a ninth century OHG. sambaz-tag (modern Samstag). Latin sabbatum as a source would not work, since no Latin church word in the German lexicon had OHG. z (zz) for original Latin t. Because of this phonological criterion, Kluge, as early as 1889, decided to separate Samstag from Latin terminology. Kluge felt that this supposition was still further favored by the fact that the epenthetic -m- of the OHG. sambaz-tag appears in areas east of the German speech area: Old Slavic sǫbota, Hung. szombat and Rumanian sâmbătă. Here are two phonological developments in sambaz-tag, the -m- and the -z-, which forbid deriving this form from Latin sabbatum. Kluge makes the telling point that Western sources, numerous enough, reveal no Vulgar Latin sambatum;[27] a thorough checking in medieval Latin glossaries confirms Kluge here.

Since Samstag is of course High German, its closest relatives, reasoned Kluge, are to be sought to the east, in the area of the

lower Danube, where the Goths had once been. However, the seemingly insurmountable phonological difficulty at this point is that the Gothic shows no inner -m-. After all, Wulfila (Ulfilas, d. 381), Christianizer of the Goths, wrote sabbatô, sabbatus—never sambatô, sambatus—in agreement with the -ββ- of the literary Greek source-form. Kluge says that in 1889 he suggested that a Vulgar Greek *σάμβατον with -μβ- would be found.[28] As will be noted below, this evidence was later found. Thus, it was entirely logical to assume a popular Gothic *sambatô from an attested popular Greek *σάμβατον, the Gothic popular *sambatô clearly being the only possible source of OHG. sambaz-, satisfying geographical and phonological requirements. That *sambatô does not appear in Wulfila's translation of the Gospels is due to the fact that Wulfila could hardly permit any but the standard, proper literary form sabbatô to stand in Holy Writ.

In Kluge's third (Strassburg, 1884) edition of his Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache there is no attempt as yet to explain the nasal in Samstag < MHG. samztac sampstac < OHG. sambaztag; but from 1889 on Kluge espoused the theory outlined above.[29] With the comparison of Persian šamba aiding the hypothesizing of a Greek *σάμβατον, Kluge supposed that a fourth or fifth century Oriental Gothic *sambatô came to the upper Germans and the Slavs from Greek (with Arianism, cf. Kirche, Pfaffe, and the like). This theory has continued, with some additions and modifications through the various editions of Kluge's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutchen Sprache into the eleventh edition of 1934, as revised by Alfred Götze. In this dictionary see particularly the Kirche article. The oldest Christian loan words in German, such as Engel, Ertag, Pfinztag, Samstag, Heide, Pfaffe, Pfingsten, taufen, Teufel, Woche, were brought to the Germans by Gothic-speaking Arian missionaries from the Gothic realm of Theodoric (d. 526), such terms passing up the Danube and down the Rhine to various Germanic tribes. (For convenience, the German examples cited are given in their modern form.)

But if the inspiration for the general approach was largely from Kluge, the adducing of many of the materials tending to prove such a theory was Schulze's and Gustav Meyer's.

Gustav Meyer in 1893 collected certain examples to prove the existence of a parallel, though Vulgar Greek form *σάμβατον.[30] A late Greek inscription, dating from the period of the Roman Empire and found at Naukratis in Egypt has in the second of three lines: [σ]υνόδω σαμ βαθι κῆ.[31]

Meyer reads this as ἐν συνόδῳ σαμβαθικῇ, interpreting this as

meaning "at a gathering taking place on the Sabbath." Thus, σαμβαθικός would be the adjective from a supposed *σάμβατον. The θ for τ presents no problem, since it is found in Egyptian Greek,[32] or may simply be the Greek transcription θ theta for Hebrew ת (tāw-thāw) current in later periods.[33] This appearance of -mb- in an adjectival form of Sabbath in Greek is paralleled by many names based on the Sabbath element and likewise showing -mb-. There are also other proper names or words which seem to attest to a change of -ββ- to -μβ- in the popular language.

Meyer gives from Egyptian Greek papyri: Σαμβᾶς, Σαμβαθούς, Σαμβᾶτος, Σαμβαθίωνος, and the like.[34] Actually such forms are even older. Meisterhans has Σαμβατείς, Σαμβατιος, side by side with Σαββατώ.[35]

Meyer also cites Persian and Arabic examples to show how widespread this -mb- (or -nb-) must have been in the Oriental languages: Arabic sanba(t), etc. but also sabt;[36] and Nöldeke gives similar examples: neo-Persian šanba (nb = mb) = Sabbath or week, Christian Abyssinian sambata aihūd = Sabbath of the Jews, etc.[37] Nöldeke refers the Persian forms back to the Aramaic, which do not show the nasal, at least in the written forms. However, one would expect Hebrew and Aramaic to preserve the "Holy Writ" form of such a word, no matter what popular pronunciations were developing.

That the Semitic languages had either insertion of m(n) before -b-[38] or dissimilation of the first of the two b's to an m, many examples show. Of course, the reverse is also true, and the dissimilar first consonant is often assimilated to the second.

In this connection, G. Meyer gives examples of -bb- > -mb- and -mb- > -bb-, and parallel cases of dissimilation and assimilation: -dd- >< -nd-, -gg- >< -ng-, etc.[39] These examples are given for Arabic, Hebrew, Mandaean, but also for a few Greek names of non-Semitic origin and for even some V. Latin and Romance examples.

O'Leary gives many examples of dissimilation which are purely phonetic phenomena, having nothing to do with the introduction of the typically Semitic informative n into the body of the word.[40] For example, qantal frequently appears for qattal, where the n is simply due to dissimilation and does not alter the meaning. On the other hand, it seems that Hebrew and Aramaic tend to assimilate n to a following consonant rather than to dissimilate -bb- to -nb- (-mb-), -gg- to -ng-, -dd- to -nd-, in contrast to some of the other Semitic languages. But the patterns of assimilation and dissimilation are not consistent: thus, one Semitic language may dissimilate,

another not, in the same case. Or a given Semitic language may dissimilate in one case, but not in another: Arabic sunbula(t), borrowed from Hebrew šibbôleth, but Arabic habbaba (-bb- is legitimate here, this being the measure with doubling of middle radical). Abyssinian hanbaba, however, representing the self-same verb and measure, shows dissimilation: -bb- > -n(m)b-.

Levy's Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim furnishes more material of the same nature. For example, his article on the letter M gives examples of (a) substitution of B and similar sounds for M, and (b) intercalation of M, similar to examples noted above. The contrary of (b) is also true, and we find assimilation: Hebrew 'ABBÛBH, 'IBBÛBH from Arabic 'ANBÛB; also Hebrew SIBBÔLETH from Greek συμβολή, but also Hebrew forms with corresponding nasal.[41]

Schulze has much material[42] that is parallel to that found in Gustav Meyer. As a matter of fact, at the end of his article, Gustav Meyer has a postscript[43] in which he notes that Schulze has just turned out an article which is parallel to his. However, Schulze, though aware of the -mb- (-nb-) for -bb- in Semitic languages, works a good bit more on native Greek cases of -bb->-mb- and parallel types of dissimilation such as -nt- for -tt-. For example, 'Αρύββας appears often as 'Αρνμβας.[44]

One could go on multiplying the examples of this nature, but it is clear that we are faced here with the broad phonetic phenomenon of (a) the exchange of one similar consonant for another, and (b) the dissimilation of the first part of a "doubled" or long consonant, in intervocalic position, to a consonant of the same point of articulation but of another order. That this phenomenon is quite common in Semitic and particularly in those Semitic-speaking areas in contact with the Greeks is also evident. On the other hand, Greek has its own cases of -bb- to -mb-, as particularly Schulze shows. One need not be concerned with the fact that beta was already vita in sound, since the forms of the holy Sabbath word preserved their classic b sound in Greek, regardless.

Furthermore, there are certainly enough examples of names of people and places with the Sabbath root in its -mb- form to prove a possible popular *σαμβατον (-μβ-) form for the period from some time in the Roman Empire period to the time of the Goths and Byzantine rule; one need not rely solely on the Naukratis inscription mentioned above.

We can agree with Stender-Petersen that the V. Greek *σάμβατον is not a specifically Balkan Greek phenomenon but rather an Asia Minor Greek, Oriental one,[45] as (a) the Persian and Arabic forms

for Sabbath and (b) the great number of Jewish, Christian-Jewish, and non-Jewish Sabbath-type names in that area tend to show.

We may even have a wide-spread phenomenon concerning specifically this Sabbath root and associated words covering the whole eastern end of the Mediterranean and reaching the peoples in contact with the eastern Greeks and the Jews. For example, the River Don is called by Idrisi "Al-Sabt," while Kiev is called by Constantinus Porphyrogenitus "Sambatas," each term meaning "Sabbath-place" or "resting-place," as both places were commercial stations and were so named by the Chazars.[46] This fact still further confirms the wide currency of popular eastern Greek-Semitic forms with -mb- in the Sabbath word and its derivatives, because the Chazars, who ruled the Russian princes during part of the Kievan Rus' period, were converts to Judaism (at least at the court and upper-class levels, and before they were finally conquered by Islam). To be fair, one should note that the theory of the "Nordists" explains Sambatas by Sandbakka-áss.[47] This Old Norse etymology is farfetched phonologically; and even semantically it is not entirely satisfactory: Sandbakka-áss means "sandbank-height."

I have already had occasion in this paper to list forms with -mb-, considered from the phonological point of view. However, as we see from the Al-Sabt (As-Sabt) and Sambatas just mentioned, we have a semantic-cultural grouping, the analogical force of which must have made sambaton an irresistible form at the popular or folk levels in the various languages of Greek-Semitic Asia Minor and adjacent areas, including the Gothic-Arian-Christian Black Sea Empire. Perhaps even more striking examples of the sambat-group are Σαμβήθη and Σαμβατιστής and the Sambatistai or Sabbatistai, which were popular, widespread cult terms in Greek Asia Minor and overlapped into the first few centuries of the Christian area. Σαμβήθη was the "Hebrew Sibyll," often thought of as "Goddess of the Sabbath-River." Σαμβατιστής was, it is believed, considered the male counterpart of the Σαμβήθη goddess or prophet.[48]

These terms might well form the subject for a study in themselves; the purposes of this study prohibit adducing any more of such examples than are required to prove the great currency of the vulgar or popular Greek *σάμβατον, hence popular Gothic *sambatô forms, the Gothic being directly dependent upon the Greek. Nevertheless, it is tempting to include at least one more example from this general group: Sambatyon, Sabbation, Sabation,[49] a river variously located, to which supernatural characteristics were gradually attributed. Pliny said that the river rested one day in seven,

on the Sabbath. In the ninth century, Eldad the Danite chronicles that the river is waterless but that its stones and sands roar and roll during the week but are at rest on the Sabbath. Targumists were fond of repeating the tale that the Ten Lost Tribes were located beyond the River Sambatyon.

To sum up the reasoning up to this point: (a) It may be regarded as established that a popular, nonliterary Vulgar Greek *σάμβατον existed in the early centuries of the Christian era, but, more important, phonological and semantic-cultural evidence attests to its widespread currency for the area and the time leading up to the Greek-Arian-Gothic contacts. (b) The Arian-Christian Wulfila, Bishop to the Goths, almost slavishly followed the Greek pattern, as the Gothic system of writing he invented and his translations indicate; consequently, the official Gothic translation by Bishop Wulfila could not permit any but the proper, respectable, standard Church forms, specifically Gothic sabbatô from Greek *σάμβατον. (c) However, most Germanists, such as Friedrich Kluge, Alfred Götze, Sigmund Feist, and others, agree that important evidence, including words such as Pfingsten (Pentecost), Pfaffe, Samstag (OHG. Sambaz-tag), reflects a tradition of the borrowing of a whole series of Christian terms, both popular and canonical, by the German tribes from their more advanced Gothic neighbors and kinsmen. (d) Thus, though Wulfila's Holy Writ text could not actually include a popular *sambatô, the Goths' deep dependency upon Greek Christian culture, both literary and popular, the overwhelming popularity of the Vulgar Greek *σάμβατον form, and, finally, the reflection of a Gothic form of this origin in Old High German, attest to the near certainty of a popular Gothic *sambatô in the time of the Gothic-Arian-Christian Black Sea Empire, whose Christianizer was Wulfila (d. 381), "Bishop of the Goths," and whose last leader before Attila's Hunnish hordes destroyed it was Ermanarīc (d. 376).

As for the relationship of the Slavs and the Goths, it is almost gratuitous to recall the well-known fact of their close connection, begun even before the Goths moved down into the area north of the Black Sea. However, it is worthwhile to emphasize that by the fourth century the various Slavic tribes—the "Venethi, Antes, and Sclaveni [Slověne]"—were thoroughly integrated into the Gothic Black Sea Empire, particularly at the time of King Ermanarīc (Hermanrīc) and Bishop Wulfila. The Slavic people, or a good part of it, were if not entirely subservient to the Gothic master at least certainly in the position of subordinate to an extremely powerful hegemonist. Jordanes, "Historian of the Goths," quite emphatically states (see especially Chapter XXIII): "Venethi, Antes, Sclaveni

. . . omnes Hermanarici imperiis servierunt." The Slavs were in a position to learn from the more advanced Goths who had had the opportunity to be in contact, through the Greeks, with the Christian Mediterranean culture. Although the Slavs were not Christianized at this time, they absorbed many everyday concepts which were part of the Christian Mediterranean culture. Sǫbota must have been one of the terms thus absorbed into the Common Slavic lexicon.

However, if we can agree that sǫbota (from Gothic *sambatô) was already in the Slavic lexicon from the fourth to the ninth centuries, what was the form which the official Apostles to the Slavs, Cyril (Constantine) and Methodius, used in their own writings in the 860's? The answer must be, as a matter of logic, that no matter how strong the influence of *σάμβατον and associated -μβ- forms at the popular, non-canonical level, the Brothers Cyril and Methodius, as men of culture and learned Church officials, would not have cared to introduce a vulgar sǫbota form in their missionary and translation work in Moravia and Pannonia. Nor, on the other hand, would they have ignored a proper sobota, if they found such already in use there or elsewhere. In this I agree with Stender-Petersen[50] and disagree with Johann Melich. Melich believes that Slavic sǫbota from Greek *σάμβατον was already part of the Brothers' vocabulary before their arrival in Moravia and that, conversely, sobota was part of the native Slav vocabulary found by the Brothers in Moravia.[51]

Stender-Petersen also makes the point that it is doubtful that Cyril and Methodius, as representatives of their own age, were in a position to introduce among the Slavs an ultimately Oriental, Asia Minor *σάμβατον (>sǫbot[a]), of which we know only that it existed as a popular form in the east of the Greek area four or five centuries before their time.

The Old Slavic religious documents, which are eleventh-century or possibly slightly earlier copies of the Bible translations made by Cyril and Methodius and their disciples at the end of the ninth century, show both the Cyrillian official sobota form and the old, popular sǫbota form. Interestingly enough the Codex Marianus—a text of the Four Gospels in the older glagolitic alphabet, one of the oldest of the Old Slavic literary monuments and one of those least affected by recopying and regionalisms, and therefore probably quite close to the Old Slavic (Old Bulgarian) actually used by the Brothers in their work—shows sobota only. (The sobota form was of course introduced or reinforced in western Slavdom by the authority of the Catholic Latin (and Romance) forms sabbata or sabbatum. However, the later periods are not the concern of this study.)

To sum up the conclusions of this paper about the origins of the sǫbota word, a Gothic-Arian-Christian *sambatô, not reflected in any of the forms used by Wulfila, because popular and nonliterary, must be assumed as the intermediary between an early, popular Greek *σάμβατον and the Slavic sǫbota. Historically, the Goths—then being converted by Wulfila to Arian Christianity, an eastern Mediterranean development—were the only people in a position to pass on this early, popular Greek *σάμβατον to the Slavs, over whom they were hegemonists, if not complete masters,[52] up to the moment when Hermanrīc's Black Sea Empire crumpled before the invasion of the Hun.

Notes

1. There are also Croatian forms which fit the non-nasal pattern. The forms in the various Slavic languages are: OCS. sǫbota, sobota; R. sub(b)ota; WR. and Uk. subota; B. sъbota; P. sobota; Sorb. sobota; Polab. süöbüöta (sübüta, sübüda, subuda, süboída, sibötta); Cz. sobota; Slk. sobota; Serbo-Croatian sùbota; Slovene sobóta; Croat.-kajk. and North Dalm. sobȏta. Non-Slavic forms dependent upon Slavic sources include Rum. sîmbătă, now written sâmbătă; Magy. szombat; Lith. subata, sabata (but also šeštádienis; i.e., sixth day!).

2. There are other less striking points of view. Melich, for example, represents a mixed point of view. See note 50 below.

3. Franz Miklosich, "Die christliche Terminologie der Slaven," in K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Denkschriften der Philosophisch-hist. Klasse, XXIV (1876), 20, 21.

4. P. Skok, "La Semaine slave," in Revue des études slaves, V (1925), 20.

5. Miklosich, pp. 20, 21.

6. Skok, p. 19.

7. Ibid., pp. 19, 20.

8. Skok seems to forget at this moment that there is nothing clear about an -a ending as such, since Slavic -a can be the reflex of either a long o or a long a.

9. Skok, p. 14. See pp. 18, 19 for other strong expressions of this criticism.

10. Miklosich, p. 19.

11. For an account of the growing indefensibility and obsolescence of Miklosich's theory and of Kopitar's even more extreme form of "Pannonism," see V. Jagić, Denkschriften, XLVII (1900), 1st and 2nd

halves; and also W. Vondrák, Altkirchenslavische Grammatik, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1912), Introduction, especially pp. 7-16.

12. Skok, p. 19. See also W. Meyer-Lübke, Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1935) for all Romance forms from L. sabbatum and the hypothetical VL. *sambatum.

13. Albert Thumb, "Die albanesischen Wochentage," in Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung, I (1901), 173-175.

14. By "Oriental" Meyer-Lübke and his sources meant, in this case, Asia-Minor Greek, Aramaic, Hebrew, etc.

15. Skok, p. 10.

16. Authoritative articles about the Patriarchate of Aquileia, such as Prof. Pio Paschini's "Patriarcato di Aquileia," in Enciclopedia Italiana (Milano, Roma, 1929), V, 805-808, do not give the impression that the Aquileian religious terminology was something apart from that of Italy and the rest of Latin Christendom.

17. Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Etym. Wbch., Item 7479.

18. A. Ernout et A. Meillet, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine (Paris: Klincksieck, 1932).

19. See Meyer-Lübke, Item 7561, for forms such as Provencal savuk; Port. sabugo; Engandine sambüi. It may very well be that the form sabūcus ("elder-tree") was contaminated in the direction of its by-form sambūcus (-mb-) through the influence of the near-homonym sambūca (from Greek σαμβύκη, a musical instrument of Asiatic origin).

20. Ernout et Meillet, Dict. étym. lat.

21. Skok, pp. 14, 18, and accompanying notes.

22. Skok, p. 18.

23. See Matteo Bartoli, "Riflessi slavi di vocali labiali romane, e romanze, greche e germaniche," in Jagić-Festschrift (1908), p. 216.

24. Skok, p. 18. Though not so noted by Skok, Melich already has this in his article "Die Namen der Wochentage im Slavischen," in Jagić-Festschrift (1908), p. 216.

25. Skok, p. 21.

26. F. Kluge, Wortforschung und Wortgeschichte (Leipzig, 1912), pp. 151, 152.

27. This seems not quite so. Meyer-Lübke, in both his Etymologisches Wörterbuch and in his article "Die Namen der Wochentage im Romanischen," in Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung, I (1901), 192-193, gives such apparent traces or vestiges of a VL. *sambatum, in terms of supposed Romance reflexes thereof. However, as far as medieval MSS and glosses are concerned, no such *sambatum is found, and in this respect Kluge is completely

accurate. See C. Du Cange's Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis, new edition by L. Favre (Niort, 1883-87). Furthermore, the supposed vestiges of VL. *sambatum are such forms as French samedi which is actually from septima dies!

28. It is interesting to note that, despite what Kluge says above in his 1912 article, he had not, as a matter of fact, quite clearly insisted in his earlier supposition on the Vulgar Greek qualification, so that one finds Schulze saying in 1894 (Indogermanische Forschungen, IV, 328, 329): "Ich halte nun Kluges Erklärung, nach der dieses *sambat-sambaz- aus dergriechischen Kirchensprache des Ostens entlehnt sein soll, für ziemlich unwahrscheinlich. Die griechische Kirchensprache hat gewiss ein σάμβατον so wenig gekannt wie die lateinische ein sambatum . . . " (italicization of "Kirchen-" is mine).

29. In the fifth edition of his Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (Strassburg, 1894), and in F. Kluge "Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte," in Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, ed. by Hermann Paul, I (Strassburg, 1901), 359-360.

30. Gustav Meyer, "Zur Geschichte des Wortes Samstag," in Indogermanische Forschungen, IV (1894), 326-334.

31. Ibid., p. 327, quoted in turn from Ernest A. Gardner, Naukratis, Part II (London, 1888), Table XXII, No. 15, p. 68.

32. Meyer, p. 327; Meyer cites (1) Buresch and (2) Muss-Arnolt, which see: (1) K. Buresch, Philologus, LI (1893), p. 95 (the same material in great detail may be found in the "Sambethe" article in A. F. von Pauly, Real-Encyclopädie der Class. Altertumwissenschaft, revised by G. Wissowa and others (Stuttgart, 1894-1953); (2) W. Muss-Arnolt, On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin, in Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXIII (1892).

33. Since the "Bghadhkphath" group of letters in Hebrew and Aramaic and Syriac had a so-called soft (fricative, in time) quality in generally post-vocalic position, including šəwa, it was quite easy to represent Hebrew taw (taw-thaw) as in this case, by Greek theta rather than tau.

34. Meyer, p. 327.

35. K. Meisterhans, Gram. der Attischen Inschriften (1900), p. 84, note 717.

36. Meyer, p. 329.

37. Th. Nöldeke, "Die Namen der Wochentage bei den Semiten," in Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung, I (1901), 163.

38. One should point out that n can be graphic for m, before b in some Arabic words.

39. Meyer, pp. 330-333.

40. D. L. O'Leary, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (London, 1923), pp. 68-88.

41. Jacob Levy, Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim (Berlin, 1924), I-IV.

42. Wilhelm Schulze, "Samstag," in Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, XXXIII (1893-95), 366-386.

43. Meyer, p. 334.

44. Schulze, p. 377.

45. Adolf Stender-Petersen, Slavisch-Germanische Lehnwortkunde (Göteborg, 1927), p. 435.

46. Max Seligsohn, "Sambation, Sanbation, Sabation" [the legendary Sabbatic river], in The Jewish Encyclopedia (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901-1905), X, 683.

47. Wilhelm Thomsen, "Nachalo russkago gosudarstva," in (Moscow) Chteniia v Imp. Obshch. Ist. i Drev. Ross., CLVI (1891), 64. However, Thomsen only suggests as possibilities to explain Σαμβατας Old Norse Sandbakki, "sandbank"; or Sandbakka-áss, "sandy elevation."

48. See articles on "Sambethe," pp. 2119-2121, and "Sabbatistai (Sambatistai)," pp. 1559-1565, in the Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie der Class. Altertumwissenschaft (articles by Nagl, Gressman, and others).

49. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, also Jewish Encyclopedia, and Encyclopaedia Britannica, under items "Sabbation" and "Sambation."

50. Stender-Petersen, p. 436.

51. J. Melich, "Die Namen der Wochentage im Slavischen," in Jagić-Festschrift (1908), pp. 214, 215. Melich favors Latin-Romance origin, supplemented by German elements, for most of the terminology of a Christian nature found by the Brothers in Moravia and Pannonia: "Als Cyril und Method nach Mähren und Pannonien kamen, fanden sie diese lateinisch-romanische Terminologie bereits vor, in welcher freilich auch deutsche Elemente vorhanden waren" (p. 217).

52. It is true that Jordanes' claims cannot always be viewed uncritically; however, there is no question among historians but that the Slavs were in a position of close dependency vis-à-vis the Goths.

RUSSIAN CALQUES IN THE BALTO-FINNIC LANGUAGES

By Felix Oinas
Instructor in Slavic Studies at Indiana University

Introductory Notes

0. Relations between the Russian and Balto-Finnic peoples have extended over a period of more than a thousand years. Such lasting intercourse might be expected to be reflected in the languages concerned, and indeed we find that some Old Russian loan words have entered the Balto-Finnic vocabularies and vice versa.[1] Further influence is seen, though to a lesser extent, in the morphological and syntactical aspects of the Balto-Finnic languages. The influence of Russian on Balto-Finnic has been considerably stronger than the reverse, a fact which has not yet been accounted for satisfactorily. The cultural level of Russians and Balto-Finns was almost the same at the time of their earliest contacts; the greater number of Russian elements in Balto-Finnic than the Balto-Finnic ones in Russian may perhaps be due to superior status of the Russians. As the wide distribution of the oldest Russian loan words in Balto-Finnic languages indicates, they must have been borrowed at a time when the connection between the various Balto-Finnic tribes was much closer than at present, so close that a word could spread without any difficulty through the entire language area.[2]

The amount of more recent Russian influence on Balto-Finnic languages differs greatly among the various languages. It is least in Livonian, which, since the arrival of Livonians at the Baltic seacoast, has had no common border with Russian. The few loan words from Russian which appear, have reached it through Lettish. The number of later Russian elements in Estonian (except the easternmost dialects of Setu) and in the western Finnish dialects is also rather small. There are certain Russianisms of later origin to be found in the eastern Finnish dialects, but by no means as many as in the languages to the east and southeast of them—in Karelian-Olonetsian, Ludic, Vepsian, and Votic. The abundance of Russian elements in this latter group (which we shall call the eastern Balto-Finnic languages) is due to these peoples having lived contiguously with the Russians ever since the eleventh century.

The Russian colonies in these areas were at first thinly scattered, but they have become more and more numerous over the centuries. Penetration of a large Russian population into what is now northwestern Russia divided the previously contiguous Balto-Finnic areas. Russian policy during recent centuries has deliberately exerted more or less pressure to Russify the non-Russian groups. Thus the bulk of eastern Balto-Finnic peoples are now bilingual, and they are gradually giving up their own languages for Russian. This process has gone furthest in Vepsian.

As in all bilingual areas, the tendency of borrowing calques of different kinds—loan-translations, and Russian-like constructions in morphology and syntax—is noticeable also in the eastern Balto-Finnic languages. In comparison with the contact-loans, the number of calques there is much smaller. Though Russian calques in Balto-Finnic have been noted in various studies for more than half a century, only a small number have been discovered, partially because the problem has never been studied in detail and partially because the number of these calques is limited.[3] The prerequisite for penetration of calques into any language is a fairly good command of a foreign language by a community, a command which amounts more or less to bilingualism. As for the eastern Balto-Finnic peoples, their bilingualism is of rather recent date. Consequently, the Russian calques in these languages belong to comparatively recent formations.

In this paper, an attempt will be made to contribute to the solution of the problem of Russian calques in Balto-Finnic, i.e. to the loan translations, and to the Russian-like use of postpositions and cases. I have systematically gone through all the available text collections and dictionaries and registered the cases which have not been dealt with by former investigators. Even so, this paper makes no claim of being exhaustive. A painstaking comparison of the eastern Balto-Finnic languages and Russian would no doubt reveal more examples of this influence. The number of the Russian calques can also be readily increased if one includes the calques found in the Soviet textbooks prepared for schools of various Balto-Finnic peoples. For this study, only one such textbook has been used.[4]

Russian loan translations and Russian-like constructions in Balto-Finnic languages are not difficult to recognize, for Russian and Balto-Finnic have entirely different genetic heritages, and their modes of expression and their grammatical structure are completely different. The main criterion which I have used for determining a Russianism is as follows: If a language contiguous

to the Russians has particular usages similar to Russian, while at the same time the other Balto-Finnic languages have completely different expressions, then I have felt that I can rightly assume that these Russian-like expressions come from Russian influence. From considerations of space, I shall refer in this paper only to the Russian-like expressions; in each case I have checked these expressions in the other Balto-Finnic languages and have ascertained that in them the corresponding ideas are expressed differently.

1. Russian loan translations.

1.1. In Ludic, the expression "to give thanks" is quite commonly used; e.g., (LKN, p. 21) da and^{u} oi spassibon tsarile "and (he) thanked (lit., gave thanks to) the tsar"; (p. 32) īvan andàŭ spas's'iboid "Ivan thanks (him)." For additional examples see pp. 127, 136, 143 and LS s.v. spasibo. This expression originates in Russian, cf. (Dal s.v. spasat') podali spasibo "they thanked (lit., gave thanks)."

1.2. In Vepsian the verb avaita "to open" means also "to reveal, disclose"; e.g. (Andrejev, p. 86) miše . . . ni savun zapah ij avaitaiž "Jermakod" "that the smell of smoke would not reveal the 'Jermak' [ship's name]." The latter meaning has developed under the influence of Russian otkryt' "to open; to reveal, disclose."

1.3. In eastern Balto-Finnic languages the expression "bread and salt" is used on the Russian model as follows:

1.31. As the greeting when one enters the room where people are eating, in Olonetsian: (Pohjanvalo) terveh teile leiby-suolu "hello you, bread-salt!" Cf. the same greeting used in Russian by one who enters during the dinner: (Dal) khleb-sol'! or khleb da sol'! "bread (and) salt!"

1.32. In the meaning "hospitality, favors" in Vepsian: (NEV, I, 50) eñz'n'e leib da sou unohtaze vai ī "will the former kindness be forgotten or not?" It is synonymous with the word hüvüz: (ibid.) eñz'n'e hüvüz unohtase vai ī id. Cf. Russ. khlebosol' "favors" in the expression (Afanas'ev, p. 26) a tam delai kak znaesh', koli khleba-soli moei ne popomnish' "and there do as you like, if you don't remember my (former) favors."

1.4. There are several stereotyped phrases in Balto-Finnic fairy tales that seem to be borrowed from Russian fairy tales. One of these is the expression "for a stretch, for some extent of distance" in Ludic: (LKN, p. 193) loittoze vai lähile šin'n'ä merd müöi ajoi "(he) sailed there for a stretch (lit., far or near) on the sea"; (p. 194) ajet't'ī loittoze vai lähin "(they) sailed some

distance." Cf. Russ. daleko li, blizko li "either far or near." For other formula-like folklore expressions in Balto-Finnic, taken over from Russian, see 2.23.

1.5. Vepsian lukta "to read" is used in the meaning "to count," on the model of Russian, in designating age: (Andrejev, p. 46) Toine prihaine, Nikolka, lugi rodindaspäi kuumed vot enamban "the other boy, Nikolka, was (lit., read) six years older." Cf. various Russian verbs from the stem ch(i)t- meaning both "to read" and "to count" (chitat' "to read," schitat' "to count," naschitat' "to count," etc.).

1.6 In the Salmi dialect of Olonetsian, muamittari means, according to Pohjanvalo, both a "land-surveyor" and a "green leaf-worm, measuring worm." The semantic change "land-surveyor" to "leaf-worm" is quite understandable, for this worm moves along as if measuring land. This semantic change seems not to have occurred independently in this restricted area of Balto-Finnic but rather under the influence of Russian, where its exact counterpart has a wider occurrence; cf. Russ. (Dal) zemlemer, zemlemerka which besides "land-surveyor" means also "butterfly (moth) from the genus 'geometrus' whose caterpillar crawls with setae as if measuring land." The second part of the word muamittari, namely mittari "measurer" is in the Balto-Finnic languages known more widely in the meaning of "worm" (e.g., in Finnish and Karelian), but in this change of "worm" to "measurer" no foreign influence need be supposed.

1.7. The Vepsian expression mändä vägespäi "to become exhausted, worn out," e.g., (Andrejev, p. 85) I prihaine läks' vägespei "and the boy became very tired (lit., went out of strength)" is a Russianism; cf. vyiti iz sil "to become exhausted."

1.8. The North-Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 91) n'el(l)kümittšed "memorial service," a derivation from nel'küme "forty," is a loan translation from Russian; cf. Russ. (Dal) sorokoviny, sorochiny "memorial service, prayer, on the fortieth day after death."

1.9. The Vepsian otnukse, the reflexive of the verb otta "to take" has also the meaning, on the Russian model, "to appear suddenly": (Andrejev, p. 44) Kuspeise otnus, übusidme jokseb strelal jäniš "suddenly, the hare runs on the snowdrifts like an arrow"; cf. Russ. otkuda ni voz'mis' "suddenly appears."

1.10. The verb panna "to put, place" is used in the eastern Balto-Finnic languages in various Russian-like constructions:

1.101. "To appoint (a time), to fix (a term)": Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 79) kūz' vuott ol'i pannu "he had fixed a time of six years"; Ludic (LS, v.s. panna) strok pandau "the term is fixed"; (LKN, p. 158) pandai s'en vastài päivid "(they) set such and such a number

of days"; Olonetsian (TAK, p. 83) pane- "to set." Cf. Russ. polozhit' srok "to fix the term."

1.102. "To beat": Karelian (TVKK, p. 121) paŋgoa n'iskah! "beat! (lit., put into the neck)." Cf. Russ. (Dal) naklast' v sheiu "to beat."

1.103. "To prepare (the samovar)": Ludic (LS) käske panda samavar "order the samovar to be prepared (lit., to put)"; LKN, p. 2) šĭdə̑ pandàŭ sa·mva·r "then (they) prepare the samovar." Cf. Russ. stavit' samovar "to set up the samovar."

1.104. "To set a person on his feet, to help someone get established": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 48) i se toivoti händast panda jougoile "and he promised to get him established (lit., to put on his feet)"; cf. Russ. postavit' na nogi "to set (someone) on (his) feet."

1.105. "To count (by an abacus)": Ludic (LKN, p. 21) koñz kui on tiähtèd taivăhàs, ei sua n'i teilĕ t'š'oĭil pandă "when the stars are in the sky, even you cannot count (them)"; cf. Russ. (Dal) klast' na schotakh "to count by an abacus, by bones."

1.11. The Russian-like use of the pronoun se "it, this":

1.111. The Vepsian se . . . se "sometimes, at times . . . at others, now . . . now": (Andrejev, p. 83) avoitelda se lujemba, se vähemba "to help now more, now less"; cf. Russ. to . . . to "sometimes, now . . . now."

1.112. The Vepsian minse "something": (Andrejev, p. 84) nügude, konz Ždan sanub minse telegrafistale "now when Zhdan says something to the telegraphist"; cf. Russ. chto-to "something."

1.113. Votic selle takaz "ago": (NVK, p. 144) kẹlmẹt kūt sellè takaz "three months ago (lit., to it back)"; cf. Russ. tomu nazad "ago."

1.114. The model of the Vepsian expression sil tšaassul "at this moment"—e.g., (Lönnrot, p. 4) i sil tšaassul havad avaisihe "and at this moment the bag opened itself," and Olonetsian sil čāssul (id.); e.g., (KKN, II, 34) sil čässul häi karahtih tul'i "at this moment he came skipping"—is to be sought in Russ. seichas "at once, immediately." The first part of seichas, namely sei-, has been translated into Olonetsian, and the second part, -chas, has been taken over intact.

1.115. The Vepsian and Ludic pronoun sežo, seže, etc., "the same"—e.g., Vepsian (VMLT, p. 537) mösten sežo hebōn'e joksob "the same horse is running again"; (Setälä-Kala, p. 274) n'ägišt s'enžo ukon "he saw the same old man"; Ludic (LS, s.v. -že) seže karu "the same devil"—is similar to the previous one (1.114) in its formation. It is modeled on the Russ. to zhe (samoe) "the same," the first part of which, to, has been translated into Vepsian, the

second, zhe (dial. zho), taken over directly. Cf. the similar Vepsian formation a s'e "or else" (from Russ. a to); see Virittäjä, 1952, pp. 106-7.

1.116. The Vepsian expression se i kaču "the first thing you know, I wouldn't be surprised if, I'll bet": (Andrejev, p. 20) Mäneb, ah, se i kaču, mäneb neče kezrušk gallerejale "oh, I'll bet (lit., and look this), this fidgety boy may go to the gallery." Cf. Russ. togo i gliadi, on pridet "I'll bet, he will come (at any moment)."

1.12. Karelian tijä, teä, originally an imperative (meaning "know!"), is commonly used in the sense "all the time, still, just": (KKN, I, 69, twice) tijä lut'ikkoida tappòa "you just kill the bedbugs"; (p. 25) t'ijä s'ie k'iugialla is'tuo "you just sit on the stove"; (KKN, II, 11) näi . . . teä toroad a et kačo ku oma sinun kod'i palau "well, you are fighting all the time and do not see that your own home is burning." In the same text collection, znai has sometimes been used instead of tijä, teä: (I, 23) h'iän znai pergau molotkalla "he all the time hits with hammer"; additional examples on pp. 49, 59. The original for both tijä, teä and znai is, of course, Russian znai "all the time, just (lit., know!)," e.g. (Afanas'ev, p. 425) znai na pechi lezhi "you just lie on the stove."

1.13. In the (Olonetsian) Salmi dictionary by Pohjanvalo, a few words are to be found which are derived by the suffix -toi, -töi "without," on the model of Russian:

1.131. siätöi "bad weather (lit., without weather)"; cf. Russ. bezpogoditsa (id.).

1.132. kattšomatoi "guttersnipe, gutter child, wastrel, waif, homeless child (lit., without looking)"; cf. Russ. besprizornik (id.) (from the verb zret' "to see, look").

1.14. The Russianisms in the use of the verb vedä- "to convey, transport":

1.141. "To take, lead": Ludic (LS) mužik lähtou hebod vedamài kod'i "the man is going to take the horse home"; (LKN, p. 166) tämĭd vedau molod'ijoid, villäšt vaŧet müöi "(she) is leading the young couple along the woolen cloth"; Karelian (TVKK, p. 156) kunne heän veičen vedäv? "where is he taking the knife?" This extension of the meaning of vedä- is undoubtedly due to confusing the Russian verbs vezti "to convey" and vesti "to lead" which are homonyms. Thus the meaning of the latter word has been transferred also to the verb vedä- (originally meaning only "to convey, transport"). There are several other semantical changes in the Balto-Finnic languages that can also be accounted for by the confusion of Russian words which are near-homonyms, such as Ludic šeižuda "to stand; to cost" (cf. Russ. stoiat' "to stand" and stoit' "to cost"); Karelian-Olonetsian

kuundele- "to listen; to serve" (cf. Russ. slushat' "to listen" and sluzhit' "to serve"); see Virittäjä, 1952, pp. 112, 109. See also the examples in 1.142 and 1.143 below.

1.142. "To manage (one's affairs)": Ludic (LS) maksàŭ se miez äijän, kudam d'ielòd hüvii vedàŭ "the man has great worth who conducts (lit., conveys) his affairs well"; cf. Russ. vesti dela "to conduct (one's affairs)." This Ludic expression is based again on the confusion of Russ. vezti "to convey" and vesti "to lead, conduct."

1.143. "To weigh": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 218) jän'iž enambaŋ kahted vedab "the hare weighs more than two (kilograms)." The semantic change "to convey" to "to weigh" is understandable if we consider that in Russian the verbs for "to weigh" and "to convey" are close in sound, especially in the 3rd pers. sg. (vésit "(he) weighs" vezët "(he) conveys"). These Russian verbs have been considered identical by Vepsians, and, under the influence of this error, the Vepsian word vedä- "to convey" has come to mean also "to weigh."

1.15. The Vepsian vär "guilty," in Andrejev, p. 55, is used also in the sense "excuse me, pardon": —Vär! —sanui Ondrij muhonke "'Excuse me!' said Andrei smilingly." The latter meaning is the translation from Russian vinovat "excuse me" (cf. Russ. vinovatyi "guilty").

2. The extension of the Balto-Finnic postpositions or suffixes under the influence of certain Russian prepositions.

2.1. kera, -ke; cf. Russian preposition s.

2.11. "More than": Karelian (TVKK, p. 106) lizän kera 100 vuotta "more than (lit., with a surplus) hundred years." Cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 386) par dvesti s lishkom "a little more than a couple of hundred pairs."

2.12. ". . . and a half": Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 138) Razvad l'äks' koum'e pol'enk'e pūdad "we got three and a half poods of fat"; cf. Russ. tri s polovinoi "three and a half."

2.13. "(To extend good wishes) on special occasions": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 42) Ole terveh raštvoidenke "I wish you a merry Christmas (lit., with Christmas)"; Ludic (LKN, p. 139) prozravittai imen'inoiŋke "(they) extend congratulations on the name-day"; (p. 140) i prozravìttai händäi t'š'inuŋke "and (they) congratulate him on his promotion (lit., title)." Cf. Russ. pozdravliat' s rozhdestvom "to wish merry Christmas."

2.14. "To lay an egg": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 141) kana kakatab, munaŋk'e om "the hen is cackling, (she) is going to lay an egg (lit., is with egg)"; cf. Russ. (Dal) eta kuritsa . . . cherez den' s iaitsom

"this hen lays an egg (lit., [is] with egg) every second day."

2.2. müöt'en, m'öto, müö, -me, etc.; cf. Russian preposition po.

2.21. In a distributive sense of location: Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 115) Potom ištuzę kaik svad'opštšikad kord'id m'öto "then all the wedding guests got into their sleds"; (p. 328) sid' kävūtas bes'edalę per't'id m'e "then they have parties in one house after another"; additional examples on pp. 333, 338, 341; (Andrejev, p. 86) läksiba kaik iceze sijoidme "all of them went, each to his own place"; Ludic (LKN, p. 17) kon'd'ī olged ot', mužik d'üvȁd ot' i viěd'ī kod'il^{u}oid m^{ü}öi "the bear took the straw, the man took the grain, and both of them took them into their homes"; Karelian Nowg. (KKN, I, 125) i tüöndi kod'iloi müötɛ "and he sent them all to their homes." Cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 380) Po shkurke . . . voz'mite "(everybody) take one hide apiece"; see also Peshkovsky, p. 286.

2.22. Distributively for denoting time—usually in plural: Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 47) Pühapeividme "(on) Sundays"; (p. 21) i aigoidme spičal sibitab icelaz päs "and scratches her head from time to time with a knitting needle"; (VMLT, p. 545) hir'pulo l'endlese öl, üid'me "the hawk flies at night, nights"; for additional examples, see Andrejev, p. 53, VMLT, p. 362. Cf. Russ. po voskresen'iam "(on) Sundays," po vremenam "from time to time," po nocham "(at, on) nights"; see Shakhmatov, p. 380, Peshkovsky, p. 286.

2.23. The expression "to grow not by the year but by the hour" occurs rather often in Balto-Finnic fairy tales: Vepsian (NEV, II, 92) n'etse laps ī voz'īmu kazvab a tšasūmu kazvab "this child is growing not by the year but by the hour"; for additional examples, see Setälä-Kala, pp. 13, 59; Karelian Twer (KKN, I, 57) poigan'e rubei kazvamah, ei päivie müöt'en, a čóassuloida müöt' "the boy began to grow, not by the day but by the hour"; additional examples on pp. 56, 105. Cf. Russ. (Dal) on rastet ne po dniam, po chasam "he grows not by the day, (but) by the hour"; this expression is common in Russian fairy tales.

2.24. "For a reason": Vepsian (Ahlqvist, p. 57) Sida med pagišen teile "therefore I say to you"; (p. 58) kudamt möto mina lugen lambhan enambaks hüvuden sädajaks "for which reason I consider the sheep the greater benefactor"; for additional examples, see pp. 56, 59, 60; Ludic (LS) t'iedad, mida müö tulim sinùn tagàz "do you know the reason I married you?" Cf. Russ. pochemu "why," poetomu "therefore"; (Dal) po chto (chego) prishel? "why, for what purpose"; see also Shakhmatov, p. 381, Peshkovsky, p. 286.

2.25. "On business": Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 403) a itšin' az'oid' m'e "on my own business"; additional example on p. 404; Ludic (LS) lähtou kod'is-pieitè ajeumai omī d'ieloid müö^{i}te "he drives away from home on his own business." Cf. Russ. po delam "on business."

2.26. "In comformity with something, according to, by": Karelian (KKN, III, 76) . . . l'innašša, n'imie müöt'e nazarietašša "in a town called (lit., by name) Nazareth"; (p. 177) šanov izän nimie müöt'en "(he) calls (somebody) by his father's name." Cf. Russ. po imeni "named (lit., according to name)," po prozvaniiu "nicknamed."

Vepsian (VMLT, p. 362) meid'mu "hoikad d'eŋgad'" a heid'mu "henōžed" "in (lit., according to) our language 'poor money,' but in their language—'meagre' "; (p. 545) n'etse sana tulob mīd' m'öto "this word is like ours (lit., by us)." Cf. Russ. po-nashemu "according to our (way), in our (way)."

Ludic (LKN, p. 124) hot' end'išt müöitɛ pidàn kädes "I just hold it as before (lit., according to the previous [manner]) in my hand"; Karelian (KKN, III, 32) no leski rubei elämäh en'n'istä müöten "but the widow began to live (the same way) as before." Cf. Russ. po-prezhnemu "as before."

Ludic (LS) meid müöi i muga hüvä ol'īž "in our opinion, even so it would be good," s'e on tühd' d'ielo mindai müöi "this is an unnecessary thing in my opinion." Cf. Russ. po nashemu "in our (opinion)," po-moemu "in my (opinion)."

For additional details in the use of the Russian preposition po in the sense "in conformity to something, according to something," see Shakhmatov, p. 381, Peshkovsky, p. 286.

2.27. "By, through something": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 84) radiodme tuli vest' "by radio the news came," Radiotelegrafadme "by radio telegraph." Cf. Russ. po radio "by radio."

2.28. In connection with the verbs "to shoot at somebody," "to long for somebody, to miss somebody," "to weep (wail) for somebody," "to speak in favor of somebody": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 89) Ždan andoi prikazanjan avaita lämmöi orudijoišpei . . . motornijoid venehidme "Zhdan gave the order to open fire on the motor boats"; (NVM, p. 36) davai pal'da meidmu puškoišpäi "they began to shoot at us with guns." Cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 382) Po nikh vystrelili iz pushki "they shot at them with a cannon."

Vepsian (VMLT, p. 545) marfa se om ukod möto tusttunu "Marfa misses her husband"; (p. 466) tusttunu ol'ed akad m'öto "you long for your wife"; (Setälä-Kala, p. 484) mužik tusttij akad m'ödę "the man longed for his wife." Cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 382)

skuchat', sokhnut' po komu-n. "to long for somebody."

Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 158) Hö mamad-m'öto lujas voikt'ih'e "they wept very much for their mother"; (Posti, personal communication) veikaškan'z' sizart möde "he began to weep for his sister." Cf. Russ. plakat' po sestre "to weep for one's sister."

Ludic (LS) kaikii suad'ī händäi müö pagižmā "all of them began to speak in favour of him"; cf. Russ. (Dal) govorili po nem "(they) spoke in favor of him."

2.3. suai, -ssā, etc.; cf. Russian preposition do.

2.31. Indicating that one action has happened before another action: Vepsian (VMLT, p. 362) lapsen tegob vou mužikhassā "she gives birth to a child before the man (lit., until the man) (comes home from war)"; (Setälä-Kala, p. 342) n'etse rad lopiše n'etsil' long'hesai "this activity is thus finished by dinner"; Ludic (Kieletär, I, 5, 23-24) mur'ginaa suai ei kuit'e zavod'ida košša "it is not at all necessary to begin mowing before breakfast." In Russian, the use of the preposition do in this function is quite usual; see Shakhmatov, p. 370, Peshkovsky, p. 283.

2.32. Denotes the person to whom somebody comes about a certain matter: Ludic (LS) millai d'ielod oo šinū suai "I have a little business with you (lit., until you)"; cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 359) Kakoe vy delo imeete do menia? "what kind of business do you have for me?"

2.33. Denotes something one is greedy for: Vepsian (VMLT, p. 366) hän ahlak mamšhessā "he is very fond of women (lit., greedy until woman)," ahlak blinōh'essā "he likes pancakes very much." Cf. Russ. zhadnyi do deneg "greedy for money," okhotnik do knig "lover of books."

2.34. In negative expressions denotes an action for which one does not have time, mood, or will: Vepsian (VMLT, p. 365) tämbā i lauhassā "today there is no time for washing the floor (lit., until the floor)"; (Andrejev, p. 24) tänämbei ij opendushesei "today he does not care to study." Cf. Russ. (Shakhmatov, p. 371) ne do slov teper' "(I) have no time for words, (I) don't feel like fooling with."

2.35. "To have a certain attitude toward someone": Ludic (LKN, p. 34) ku hää ol'i īvanaisuoitE aivii paha ristittu "since she had always behaved badly toward Ivan." Cf. the use of the preposition do in Russian for expressing certain attitudes towards someone or something: (Dal) kakov ty do menia, takov ia do tebia "as you are toward me, so I will be toward you."

2.4. taga; cf. the Russian preposition za.

2.41. "For some reason": Ludic (LS, s.v. d'iel) d'ielon t[aga]

olen, tul'in "(I) am, came (here) for a reason (lit., behind a thing)"; cf. Russ. za vazhnym delom "for an important matter."

2.42. "(To pray) for something": Karelian (TVKK, p. 144) pappi mol'iv heŋgen t[aga] "the priest prays for (someone's) soul (lit., behind the soul)"; cf. Russ. molit'sia za dushu "to pray for the soul."

2.43. "To be eating": Ludic (LKN, p. 163) süöndän taga ku žen'ihhout'š'ad ištuttai stolan taga "when the people from the bridegroom's party are sitting at the table (and) eating (lit., behind eating)" cf. Russ. za obedom, za uzhinom "at dinner, supper (lit., behind dinner, supper)."

3. Russian influence on the use of Balto-Finnic cases.

3.1. The illative case.

3.11. In the expressions "(to go) to the field, to sea" (cf. 3.21): Vepsian (VMLT, p. 296) hän män' . . . lagedha pöüdhö "he went to (lit., into) the level field"; (p. 297) da ajel'emei mer'he laskmaha "and we go to the sea to put in [the nets]"; Ludic (LKN, p. 75) i suotèttai t'ämä lagedai peudoi vuoroloile n'uoǩkidavakš "and they took him to a level field for the crows to pick at"; Olonetsian (KKN, II, 5) tüöndäüv lagieh peldoh "(he) sends (him) to the level field." Cf. Russ. idti v pole, v more "to go to the field, to sea."

3.12. "(To take) a trip": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 56) konz hän kučui rahvast pitkha tehe edelespei "when he called the people to take the long way (lit., into the long way) into the future"; (VMLT, p. 299) lad'ib möst tehe ajada "(he) plans to take the trip again"; for additional examples, see VMLT, pp. 301, 307; Ludic (LKN, p. 80) ühtèi dorogài lähtenèd "if (you) go this way." Cf. Russ. idti, otpravit'sia v put' "to take a trip, to set out for a trip."

3.13. "To understand": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 310) otāžīn' an'i pitkha toukhu "(I) would hardly (?) understand (lit., take into sense)"; cf. Russ. vziat' v tolk "to understand."

3.14. "Very attentively": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 59) Pepe kundel' händast kaikhe korvhe "Pepe listened to him attentively (lit., into the whole ear)"; cf. Russ. vo vse ushi slushat' "to listen very attentively."

3.15. "(To bow) before one's feet": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 43) Kumardamoi minä sinij jougha "(I) bow before your feet"; for additional examples, see VMLT, p. 300; Ludic (LS) moĭembat milei d'aĭgai kumardut't'ī "both of them bowed before my feet"; (LKN, p. 72) kuṁmàrzīzei d'augài "(he) bowed before (their) feet"; Karelian (TVKK, p. 99) jalgah kumardih "(he) bowed before (somebody's) feet"; Votic (NVK, p. 148) kummẹrtàn sillẹ̀ jalkā "(I) bow before your feet." Cf. Russ. klaniat'sia komu-nibud' v nozhki "to bow before someone's feet."

3.16. "At the top of one's voice": Vepsian (Setälä-Kala, p. 329) i pajataškatas säkioid' pajöid', lujas kaikhe kidaha "and (they) begin to sing all kinds of songs, strongly, at the top of their voices." This is a further example of the so-called illative of manner, discussed by Kettunen in VMLT, p. 310. Cf. Russ. krichat' vo vse gorlo "to cry at the top of one's voice."

3.17. "Through the window": (Setälä-Kala, p. 343) a n'evestalę sil' aigou ij käskkoi iknaha katsta "but the bride is not allowed to look through the window (lit., into the window) at this time"; (p. 494) An'hel lenz' . . . iknaha[5] "the angel flew in through the window." Cf. Russ. smotret', vletet' v okno "to look, to fly in through the window."

3.18. "(Seven feet, etc.) long": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 303) l'et'-jär'v seitšmen virstat pid'uzhe "the Let Sea is seven versts long (lit., into length)," ühthe pitkuzhe tarbiž otta "you must take (one) of the same length." Kettunen is of the opinion that pid'uzhe might be an abstraction from the expression pid'uzhe näht "concerning the length," or something similar. Actually this is a loan translation from Russian; cf. Russ. metr v dlinu "a meter long."

3.2. The inessive case.

3.21. "(To be) in the field" (cf. 3.11): Vepsian (VMLT, p. 272) l'epikaižed l'endl'eze p'üudos "the butterflies are flying in the field"; Olonetsian (KKN, II, 7) a vot nečie lagies pellos, vihandas nītus on heboine "but there is a horse in the level field, in the green meadow." Cf. Russ. byt' v pole "to be in the field."

3.22. "Before one's eyes": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 272) silmīš muga radel' "he did this before someone's eyes (lit., inside the eyes)," silmīš ebad vargasta n'i mida "they do not steal anything before one's eyes"; (Setälä-Kala, p. 262) Tšapkam hänen sil'miš laps' k'eskū "cut the child in half before her eyes"; Ludic (LKN, p. 60) ottàu gr'īšu ostajaą sil'mīs ruušiu tr'ąpit'š'aą "Grisha spreads the rug out before the buyer." Cf. Russ. v glazakh "before the eyes."

3.3. The elative case.

"(To come) from a trip": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 282) mä tespä astun "I come from a trip (lit., from the way)," cf. Russ. pridti iz puti "to come from a trip."

3.4. The allative case.

3.41. "Home," "to the kitchen": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 341) n'etsen akan ot' kod'ile "he took this woman to his home"; Ludic (LKN, p. 120) mänou pappi kuhn'ălĕ "the priest goes to the kitchen." Cf. Russ. na dom "(to) home," na kukhniu "to the kitchen."

3.42. "Into the wind, in the air": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 342) d'olol'e pästan rugehen "I throw the rye into the wind," pez'in sobad da pan'in

ver'äil'e (~ahavol'e) kuikheze "I washed the clothes and put them out in the air (lit., to the wind) to dry." Cf. Russ. na veter "into the wind."

3.43. "(To break) into parts, pieces": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 83) i parohod katteb kahtele "and the ship breaks in two"; (VMLT, p. 343) kaiken aparole mäžot' "he hewed everything into pieces"; (p. 344) tušon tšapoin supaloil'e "I hewed the corpse into pieces"; Ludic (LKN, p. 75) leikȍttai paloileĕ "they cut (him) into pieces." Cf. Russ. raskolot'sia na dvoe "to split in two," rubit' na kuski "to cut into pieces."

3.44. "Mortally, fatally": Ludic (LKN, p. 87) ozàida kieràs štobi hää leikadùiš surmale "hit him once so that he would be mortally (lit., to death) wounded"; cf. Russ. ego ranili na smert' "he was mortally wounded."

3.45. Indicates distance: Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 70) Tedab—ümbri kahtelekümnele virstale kaplid vet iile "he knows that there is no water for twenty versts around"; Karelian (KKN, I, 50) äijällägo viršalla šiun keh peräüvümmä toin'e toizešt "how many versts shall we back away from each other"; Ludic (LKN, 86) i kūlū koumĕlĕ virstale xrapìnd "and his snoring is to be heard for three versts"; (p. 93) ku panen šuoxùŋ—kieràs s'eit'š'emĕlĕ virstălĕ "when I take a step, I at once go seven versts." Cf. Russ. na dvadtsat' verst "(for) twenty versts," na skol'ko verst? "(for) how many versts?"

3.46. In the temporal sense: Vepsian (VMLT, p. 349) lopule ved meit tahōpā "finally (lit., to the end) you take us away from our place," ol'i ükštoškime akou t'ehtut se, lapsīd', ühten vodele "the woman had delivered eleven children, one a year (lit., to a year)." Cf. Russ. nakonets "finally," na god "for a year."

3.5. The adessive case.

3.51. The adessive of comparison: Vepsian (VMLT, p. 329) ak se vodō koumō noremb mindān' "(my) wife is about three years younger than I," milān' kahtōkümn'ŏ pardō enamp sindāž "I have twenty beams more than you," hän veljet kudō vodō vanhemb "he is six years older than his brother." For additional examples, see the same source. Kettunen apparently considers it a genuine Vepsian formation: "The adessive in this function reminds one of the adessive of means, expedient, inasmuch as the ablative is not in question." There can however be no doubt that this use of the adessive, strange from the point of view of the Balto-Finnic languages, has arisen under Russian influence: cf. Russ. on starshe menia na dva goda "he is two years older than I," na dva bol'she "two more."

3.52. "This week": Vepsian (Andrejev, p. 43) A nedalil emäg käski minij sel'gitada selödkad "but this week the mistress of the house ordered me to clean the herring." Nedalil "this week" seems to be an ellipsis from the expression šil nedalil (id.), which is generally used in Vepsian. This ellipsis has most probably arisen under Russian influence: cf. Russ. na nedele "this week" (besides which there is also a longer form na etoi nedele [id.]).

3.53. "(To be) in an apartment": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 318) kes ol'īt' fat'orā? "at whose apartment did you live?"; Karelian Nowg. (KKN, I, 124) i tällä fat'eralla el'i vain ukko akaŋ ke "and in this apartment lived only the old man and his wife." Cf. Russ. na kvartire "at the apartment."

3.6. The ablative case.

"(Tub) for butter": Vepsian (VMLT, p. 339) n'etse lat'š' voilpai "this tub is for butter"; cf. Russ. bochka ot masla "butter tub."

August 1953.

Notes

1. The most important studies on the Russian—Balto-Finnic older linguistic relations are: J. J. Mikkola, Berührungen zwischen den ostseefinnischen und slavischen Sprachen (1894; MSFOu, VIII—for symbols and abbreviations used in this paper, see Appendix); the new, somewhat modified edition of the same work: Die älteren Berührungen zwischen Ostseefinnisch und Russisch (1938; MSFOu, LXXV); J. Kalima, Die ostseefinnischen Lehnwörter im Russischen (1919; MSFOu, XLIV); J. Kalima, Slaavilaisperäinen sanastomme (Our Slavic Vocabulary; Helsinki, 1952); V. Kiparsky, "Chronologie des relations slavo-baltiques et slavo-finnoises" (Revue des études slaves, XXIV, 29-47); V. Kiparsky, "The Earliest Contacts of the Russians with the Finns and Balts" (Oxford Slavonic Papers, III [1952], 67-79).

2. Kalima, Slaavilaisperäinen sanastomme, pp. 27-28.

3. A. Genetz was one of the first to indicate several Russian loan translations in the vocabularies of his Tutkimus venäjän karjalan kielestä (The Study of the Russian Karelian Language; Helsinki, 1881) and Tutkimus aunuksen kielestä (The Study of the Olonetsian Language; Helsinki, 1885). The most important contributions were made by the late J. Kalima. Since the beginning of this century, he has more or less regularly published articles on this subject, mainly in the journal Virittäjä; in addition, he has touched upon these problems also in two books—Die ostseefinnischen Lehnwörter im Russischen (Helsinki, 1919), pp. 264-265, and Slaavilaisperäinen sanastomme, pp. 28-29, 169. A few contributions to the study of Russian loan translations were made by E. N. Setälä, H. Ojansuu, J. Mägiste, and Y. H. Toivonen in the journals Virittäjä and Eesti Keel. Of the more recent works, L. Kettunen's Vepsän

murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus (The Syntactical Study on the Vepsian Dialects; Helsinki, 1943) deserves mention for its constant reference to the influence of Russian in Vepsian syntactic constructions. Another large work on Vepsian—E. A. Tunkelo's Vepsän kielen äännehistoria (Phonology of Vepsian; Helsinki, 1946) also refers to some Russianisms. Several Russian loan translations and Russian-like constructions are indicated further by R. Peltola in his (and Tunkelo's) comments on the E. N. Setälä's and J. H. Kala's Näytteitä Äänis- ja Keskivepsän murteista (Text-Examples of the Onega and Middle Vepsian Dialects; Helsinki, 1951), pp. 560-620. Russian loan translations in Ludic are occasionally noted by J. Kujola in Lyydiläismurteiden sanakirja (Dictionary of the Ludic Dialects; Helsinki, 1944). Finally, the reader may refer to my own contribution to the problem in Virittäjä, 1952, pp. 106-113.

4. F. A. Andrejev, Literaturnij hrestomatij vepskijale nacal'nijale skolale, II (Leningrad, 1934-35).

5. This word was later replaced in the MS. by iknaspäi "through the window" (see Setälä-Kala, p. 613).

Appendix: Abbreviations

Afanas'ev—A. N. Afanas'ev, Narodnyia russkiia skazki i legendy (Popular Russian Folk Tales and Legends). Vol. I; Berlin, 1922.

Ahlqvist—Aug. Ahlqvist, Anteckningar i Nord-Tschudiskan (Notes on North Vepsian). Helsinki, 1861.

Andrejev—F. A. Andrejev, Literaturnij hrestomatij vepskijale nacal'nijale skolale (Literary Anthology for the Vepsian Public Schools). Vol. II; Leningrad, 1934-35.

Dal—Vladimir Dal', Tolkovyi slovar' zhivago velikorusskago iazyka (Explanatory Dictionary of Current Great Russian). 4th ed.; Moscow, 1914.

Kieletär—Kieletär: Tutkimuksia, arvosteluja ja muistutuksia Suomen kirjallisuuden ja kielitieteen alalta (The Spirit of the Language: Studies, Critiques, and Remarks in the Field of Finnish Literature and Linguistics). Vol. I; Helsinki, 1871-73.

KKN—Karjalan kielen näytteitä (Texts of the Karelian Language). Edited by Eino Leskinen. Vols. I-III; Helsinki, 1932-36.

LKN—Lyydiläisiä kielennäytteitä (Ludic Dialect Texts). Collected by Heikki Ojansuu, Juho Kujola, Jalo Kalima, and Lauri Kettunen. MSFOu, LXIX. Helsinki, 1934.

LS—Juho Kujola, Lyydiläismurteiden sanakirja (Dictionary of Ludic Dialects). Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae. Vol. IX. Helsinki, 1944.

Lönnrot—Elias Lönnrot, Om det nord-tschudiska språket (About the North-Vepsian Language). Helsinki, 1853.

MSFOu—Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne. Helsinki, 1890—.

NEV—Lauri Kettunen, Näytteitä etelävepsästä (Texts of South Vepsian). Vol. I. Suomi, Ser. IV, Vol. 18. Helsinki, 1920.

NVK—Lauri Kettunen and Lauri Posti, Näytteitä vatjan kielestä (Texts of the Votic Language). MSFOu, LXIII. Helsinki, 1932.

NVM—Lauri Kettunen and Paavo Siro, Näytteitä vepsän murteista (Texts of Vepsian Dialects). MSFOu, LXX. Helsinki, 1935.

Peshkovsky—A. M. Peshkovskii, Russkii sintaksis v nauchnom osveshchenii (Russian Syntax on the Scientific Basis). 4th ed.; Moscow, 1934.

Pohjanvalo—Pekka Pohjanvalo, Salmin murteen sanakirja (Dictionary of the Salmi Dialect). Helsinki, 1947. —Täydennysosa (Supplement). Helsinki, 1950.

Setälä-Kala—Näytteitä Äänis- ja Keskivepsän murteista (Texts of Onega and Middle Vepsian Dialects). Collected by E. N. Setälä and J. H. Kala. Edited and translated into Finnish by E. A. Tunkelo, with the assistance of Reino Peltola. MSFOu, C. Helsinki, 1951.

Shakhmatov—A. A. Shakhmatov, Sintaksis russkogo iazyka (Syntax of the Russian Language). 2nd ed.; Leningrad, 1941.

TVKK—Arvid Genetz, Tutkimus Venäjän Karjalan kielestä (Research on the Russian-Karelian Language). Suomi, Ser. II, Vol. XIV. Helsinki, 1881.

Virittäjä—Virittäjä: Uusi jakso: Kotikielen Seuran Aikakauslehti (Tuner; New Series; Journal of the Society for the Mother-Tongue). Helsinki, 1897—.

VMLT—Lauri Kettunen, Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus (Syntactical Study on Vepsian Dialects). MSFOu, LXXXVI. Helsinki, 1943.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES

Editorial Committee

Michael Ginsburg, Norman J. G. Pounds, Thomas A. Sebeok

No. 1 Eeva K. Minn, *Studies in Cheremis,* Vol. 4, *Derivation,* 1956. $2.00

No. 2 Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw, Eds., *Indiana Slavic Studies,* Vol. 1, 1956. $3.00

In preparation:

No. 3 Piotr S. Wandycz, *Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation.* $2.50.

All correspondence should be addressed to: The Indiana University Bookstore, Union Building, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.